

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 048 679

EC 031 783

AUTHOR Kerr, Elaine B.
TITLE Final Report of the Relationship among Disability, Education, and Vocational Achievement.
INSTITUTION Just One Break, Inc., New York, N.Y.
SPONS AGENCY Social and Rehabilitation Service (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Div. of Research and Demonstration Grants.
PUB DATE 70
NOTE 93p.
EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-\$0.65 HC-\$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Achievement, Employment Experience, Employment Level, *Handicapped, Job Satisfaction, *Success Factors, *Vocational Adjustment

ABSTRACT

To determine the occupational experiences of poorly educated disabled persons, 389 disabled adults serviced by a New York City private employment agency between 1960 and 1967 were interviewed. Each was medically able to work full-time, though vocationally handicapped due to his disability, and had fewer than 12 years of schooling. An index of vocational achievement, constructed to measure ability to function in the work situation with maximum rewards, included measures of employment status, changes in salary, and changes in job level since placement. Results at followup showed the following factors associated with vocational achievement: sex (men more successful than women), age (young more successful), and socioeconomic status (upper class more successful). Disability factors associated with achievement were onset of disability before age 45 and having a disability free from stigma. Work-related factors were interest in skilled manual jobs, high pay, avoiding formal job-seeking since placement, no specific job requirements when seeking last job, holding skilled manual positions, lengthy on-the-job training, and need to work as indicated by number of dependents. (Author/KW)

EC031783

ED0 48679

A
Final Report
Of

The Relationship Among Disability,
Education, and Vocational Achievement.

By

Elaine B. Kerr
Principal Investigator

—
Fred C. Board
Project Director

EC 031783E

ED0 48679

FINAL REPORT OF THE RELATIONSHIP AMONG DISABILITY,
EDUCATION, AND VOCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENT

By

Elaine B. Kerr
Principal Investigator

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION
& WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED
EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR
ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF
VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECES-
SARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDU-
CATION POSITION OR POLICY

This investigation was supported, in part, by Research Grant
RD-2656-G from the Division of Research and Demonstration Grants, Social
and Rehabilitation Service, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare,
Washington, D.C., 20201.

Fred C. Board
Project Director
JUST ONE BREAK, INC.

Mrs. Elaine B. Kerr is currently Director of Research, Just One Break, Inc.,
717 First Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10017.

Mr. Fred C. Board is Executive Director and Chief Fiscal Officer of
Just One Break, Inc.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Abstract.....	i
Chapter I Purposes.....	1
Chapter II The Problem.....	3
Chapter III The Population.....	20
Chapter IV Procedures.....	33
Chapter V Demographic Factors Related to Vocational Achievement.....	41
Chapter VI The Relationship Between the Nature of the Disability and Vocational Achievement.....	54
Chapter VII Factors Related to the Nature of the Job.....	65
Chapter VIII Summary.....	82

FOREWORD

The most difficult of all rehabilitation is job placement. The beginning of today's interest in, and recognition of the importance of successful rehabilitation, goes back many years to the days when the need for selective placement was first realized.

Immediately following the second World War, "rehabilitation" became a well-known word to the average American. Thousands of veterans were returning to civilian life with disabilities they were to wear as permanent badges. Many of these disabled veterans were hired by business and industrial firms because they were considered "heroes." Very little, if any, thought was given to their job qualifications or abilities. The jobs of many of these veterans hired in this fashion lasted only as long as their wartime deeds and service were remembered. Ultimately, they joined the ranks of the many disabled individuals who had left rehabilitation centers only to return to the stagnation and vegetation of an unproductive life.

In 1949, a committee of young businessmen, most of whom were themselves disabled, was called together to suggest solutions to this problem. They began their task by interviewing disabled individuals to determine how each might take a competitive place within the industries represented by the committee members. They called themselves the "Just One Break Committee" because the initials spelled out their basic purpose - jobs for the physically disabled.

The time that has elapsed since the formation of the Committee has seen a gradual growth and expansion of its basic concepts and services. J.O.B., as it is popularly known, is now incorporated under the laws of New York State and has a staff of approximately twenty individuals. The

original Just One Break Committee, with additional recruits, has now become a Board of Directors. The members of this board represent a cross-section of commerce and industry in the New York area at the present time.

Over the years, J.O.B. has maintained a very strict adherence to the initial policy of presenting only the physically disabled who have been carefully screened and who are capable of competing with the able-bodied for specific jobs. As a result, employers have shown a growing confidence in J.O.B. and an increasing willingness to accept its applicants. This experience was called upon in this research study undertaken.

The richest rewards of our research lie ahead in this initial course of inquiry. Valuable as I feel this study is, I look with great expectation to the applications of its results by all organizations dealing with the disabled now, or in the future.

I acknowledge, with gratitude, the efforts of not only the author of this monograph, but of the supervisory and placement staff of Just One Break, Inc., who have worked together in this demonstration project. It is with deepest gratitude that the author and I acknowledge the cooperative efforts of the Research Department of J.O.B., and the other individuals who were so helpful in making this study possible.

Fred C. Board
Executive Director

ABSTRACT

This study was designed to discover the occupational experiences of those who are both physically disabled and poorly educated. Interviews were held with 389 permanently disabled men and women who were serviced by a private employment agency in New York City during the period 1960 through 1967. Each respondent was medically cleared for full time work, but vocationally handicapped as a result of his disability. Only people with fewer than twelve years of formal education were interviewed, in order to concentrate upon those who were likely to have the greatest difficulties in securing and maintaining employment. This study represents an important step in beginning to understand the processes of adjustment between the needs of the marginal worker and the demands of the labor market.

An index of vocational achievement was constructed to measure the ability to function in the work situation with maximum rewards, given the limitations imposed by the disabled status. Unlike most previous studies, which equated employment at follow-up with success and unemployment with failure, the measure of vocational achievement included employment status as well as changes in salary and major changes in job level since placement. Those employed at follow-up were divided into three groups: "most successful," "somewhat successful," and "least successful."

The demographic factors associated with vocational achievement are sex (men were more successful than women), age (the young were more successful), and "upper class" socio-economic status. Factors related to the nature of the disability associated with vocational achievement are onset of the disability before the age of forty-five and having disabilities which were free from stigma. Work-related factors associated with vocational achievement are interest in skilled manual jobs at intake, placement into relatively high-paying jobs, avoiding formal job-seeking channels since placement, not having specific job requirements when seeking the last job held, holding skilled manual positions at follow-up, having received lengthy on-the-job training, and having a financial need to work as indicated by the number of dependents.

Although only work-related factors are amenable to change from the point of view of the disabled individual, attention to all these factors by rehabilitation personnel should aid in attaining maximum vocational achievements.

CHAPTER I

PURPOSES

The purpose of this research is to discover the factors associated with the occupational experiences of those who are both physically handicapped and poorly educated. This is a follow-up study of the vocational experiences of 389 permanently disabled men and women with fewer than twelve years of formal education who were serviced by a private employment agency in New York City during the period 1960 through 1967. Each respondent was medically cleared for full time work, but vocationally handicapped as a result of physical disability. This study focuses on the handicapped who are doubly disadvantaged, by both their disabilities and their lack of educational achievement. Only people with fewer than twelve years of education were interviewed, in order to concentrate upon those who are likely to have the greatest difficulties in securing and maintaining employment. Some of these people are now among the "hard-core unemployed," and others have overcome their physical and educational limitations to the extent that they now hold productive and satisfying jobs.

There is a critical need for this kind of study, since little is known about what happens to the disabled after they are placed; the experiences, behaviors, and attitudes of this disadvantaged segment of society have not yet been thoroughly examined. This is a study of the influences of long-term social and physical conditions upon behavior, concentrating upon those workers who may be expected to have the greatest difficulties in the labor market, as a direct or indirect result of their

disabilities, and of their lack of educations and marketable skills.

Productive employment is usually deemed essential to a satisfactory level of self-esteem for most adults in this society. Agencies working with the disabled attempt to provide counseling, therapy, and vocational training for their clients, with the goal of placing them in useful and satisfying jobs. However, too often the tacit and untested assumption is that placement is the sole criterion of successful rehabilitation. Once placement is achieved the task is allegedly complete, except for a routine check on employment status after a give period of time has elapsed. There is not sufficient information about the post-placement experiences of the disabled to test the validity of this assumption.

Very little is known about either the problems faced by the disabled worker after placement or the factors associated with his occupational adjustment or maladjustment. The aim of this study is to help narrow the gaps in our knowledge of these processes, and thereby assist rehabilitation personnel in more effectively preparing their clients for work and in providing post-placement follow-up services. Through increased knowledge of the experiences of these workers on the job, we hope to shed light upon the factors which should be given increased attention during the periods of evaluation, counseling, placement, and follow-up.

It is anticipated that these findings will provide valuable data to those who are trying to develop effective ways of aiding the entire stratum of this society that constitutes the "hard-core unemployed," in addition to the disabled segment within this underclass of American society. The subjects of this study are one target group of the "War on Poverty" and one segment of those who are handicapped in the labor market.

CHAPTER II

THE PROBLEMReview of Previous Research on the Disabled

In searching the literature, few studies were found that dealt specifically with the post-placement experiences of the physically disabled. Although a number of studies sufficiently similar in scope or intent were located, few went beyond the simple presentation of factors associated with vocational success or failure. With the exception of the research by Jaffe, Day, and Adams, the concept of vocational success was measured only by employment or unemployment at the time of the study; in some cases full time and part-time employment were distinguished.

Jaffe and his associates studied 1316 men under the age of sixty, residing in the New York City area, who were recipients of workmen's compensation as a result of serious and permanent on-the-job injuries between 1950 and 1957 and who had been unemployed for at least one month following the accident.¹ They assumed

that the experiences of such men are probably little different from those of men who have been seriously and permanently disabled by non-job accidents. . . . On the other hand, men with congenital disabilities, or men who were injured during war, may have quite different employment experiences. Nevertheless, we have confidence that

¹A. J. Jaffe, Lincoln H. Day, and Walter Adams, Disabled Workers in the Labor Market (Totowa, New Jersey: Bedminster Press, 1964).

our findings can be generally applied to other men who had some work experience before becoming permanently and seriously disabled.¹

Three labor performance groups were identified--men with "better" jobs, men with "same or somewhat poorer" jobs, and men with "very poor or no" jobs--according to full time or part-time employment status in the year preceding the interview, and the amount of any wage change since the injury. Employment success was found to be associated with the following variables: age, education, race, marital status, level of skill, number of disabilities, recency of disability, the presence or absence of chain disability², and returning to work for the same firm.

Lesser and Darling interviewed 541 clients of the Institute for the Crippled and Disabled who received rehabilitation services in the 1940's.³ Employment or unemployment at the time of the interview was used as the criterion of vocational achievement. Success was found to be associated with age, education, age when disabled, the severity of the disability, and "capacity for physical performance." Sex was unrelated to vocational achievement when women voluntarily out of the labor market were excluded.

McPhee interviewed 835 people who had been serviced by the Divi-

¹Ibid., p. xi.

²A chain disability is defined as "an injury with at least one recurrence that had added to the original disability"; Ibid., p. 50.

³Marion S. Lesser and Robert C. Darling, "Factors Prognostic for Vocational Rehabilitation Among the Physically Handicapped," Research Conference on Workmen's Compensation and Vocational Rehabilitation, ed. A. J. Jaffe (New York: Columbia University, Bureau of Applied Social Research, 1961), pp. 98-108.

sions of Vocational Rehabilitation in Utah, Montana, and Wyoming between 1949 and 1954 and who were employed at closure.¹ Mental and emotional disabilities were included in addition to physical ones. The criterion of successful rehabilitation was full time or part-time employment status at the time of the interview and for the ten months preceding it. The factors associated with full time employment were age, sex, education, source of referral, age when disabled, "state of health," career aspirations, earnings at closure, and the prognosis of the disability. The cause of the disability and previous work history did not distinguish the groups.

Felton defined vocational adjustment as employment in competitive industry, and vocational maladjustment as employment in sheltered workshops.² Semi-structured interviews, psychological tests, and case records were examined for sixty employees of Tinker Air Force Base and forty-three employees of Oklahoma Goodwill Industries. Vocational adjustment was found to be associated with level of skill, educational achievement, marital status, number of dependents, home ownership, severity of disability, age at onset, and vocational self-image.

Ware interviewed fifty people, handicapped both physically and mentally, who had undergone rehabilitation or who were employed in sheltered workshops in Eastern Long Island.³ Employment or unemployment was

¹W. M. McPhee, "Adjustment Characteristics of Closed Rehabilitation Cases," Rehabilitation Research, eds. George N. Wright and Ann Beck Trotter (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1968), pp. 558-571.

²J. S. Felton, "Factors Influencing the Successful Vocational Adjustment of the Physically Disabled," Rehabilitation Research, eds. George N. Wright and Ann Beck Trotter (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1968), pp. 493-507.

³E. L. Ware, "The Role of Social Factors in the Life of the Disabled," Rehabilitation Research, eds. George N. Wright and Ann Beck Trotter (Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1968), pp. 514-518.

again the criterion of vocational success. The only distinguishing factors between these groups were "ratings of drive and aspiration" based on psychological test data. No differences were found by age, sex, marital status, onset of disability, or home ownership.

Schletzer and her associates studied physically and emotionally handicapped men and women drawn from the files of the Minnesota Division of Vocational Rehabilitation and the Minnesota State Employment Service.¹ Of the ninety-one interviews, thirty-nine were with the handicapped individual and fifty-two with adult relatives of this person. Placement success was measured by employment or unemployment, and no relationship was found with level of education or assistance from social agencies. There was less unemployment in professional and clerical occupations than in other occupational groupings.

A second investigation by these same authors examined the employment success, measured by employment or unemployment, of 255 physically handicapped individuals drawn at random from the general population.² However, eighteen of these people had never been in the labor force, and forty-three never returned to work after becoming disabled. The factors related to current employment were sex, age when disabled, education, marital status, number of dependents, and having been employed before becoming disabled.

¹Vera Myers Schletzer, Rene V. Dawis, George W. England, and Lloyd H. Lofquist, Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation: III, A Follow-Up Study of Placement Success (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Industrial Relations Center, 1958).

²Vera Myers Schletzer, Rene V. Dawis, George W. England, and Lloyd H. Lofquist, Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation: VII, Factors Related to Employment Success (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Industrial Relations Center, 1959).

No relationship was found with age, origin of the disability, usual occupation, and duration of unemployment before returning to work.

Tinsley et al. conducted a follow-up survey by a mail questionnaire of 2,688 former clients of the Minnesota Division of Vocational Rehabilitation whose cases were closed as working between 1963 and 1967, and 375 cases who were not working at closure.¹ They found that seventy-eight percent of the working cases were employed and eighteen percent were unemployed but in the labor force, as contrasted with an employment rate of fifty percent and an unemployment rate of forty-two percent for those who were unemployed at closure.

Mail questionnaires were sent to all graduates of the Bulova School of Watchmaking to examine the effectiveness of its vocational training program.² The respondents were all men and most were physically disabled. Since only five percent were unemployed, a breakdown of earnings by disability was presented. The data were reanalyzed according to whether the disabilities were clearly visible, or whether they were clearly not visible. Visibility is strongly related to weekly earnings. The median weekly earnings of those with visible disabilities was \$6.59 less than the total group, whereas the median salary for those with non-visible disabilities was \$4.92 more than the total group. As expected, the earnings of the non-disabled respondents were the highest of all these categories.

¹Howard E. A. Tinsley, Robert G. Warnken, David J. Weiss, Rene V. Dawis, and Lloyd H. Lofquist, Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation: XXVI, A Follow-Up Survey of Former Clients of the Minnesota Division of Vocational Rehabilitation (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Industrial Relations Center, 1969).

²Benjamin H. Lipton, Harvey J. Lifton, and Edward A. Morante, Survey of Graduates of the Joseph Bulova School of Watchmaking (New York: Joseph Bulova School of Watchmaking, 1967).

Definition of Terms

Since physique is often a criterion for social classification, and since certain physical characteristics may be considered tragic disfigurements in one society and signs of honorific achievements in another, physical disability may be defined as a variation in physique which is negatively valued. Because these societal values are usually internalized, social effects are both cumulative and circular.

The major problems of the disabled are often social and psychological in nature, rather than physical. The disabled person must learn to adjust to his changed capabilities. According to Allport, physique is one of the principal raw materials of personality.¹ According to one observer of the disabled: "Visible physical characteristics evoke reactions which, depending upon our particular cultural values, may be those of immediate repulsion or attraction."² The disabled person typically encounters social situations in which the boundaries of action are uncertain. An optimum social adjustment includes self-confidence, freedom from self-pity, freedom from attachment to impossible goals, and perhaps most importantly, the distinction between self-image as physique and physique as a tool to be manipulated.

The social and physical aspects of the problem will be distinguished by the terms handicap and disability. According to Hamilton,

¹G. W. Allport, Personality: A Psychological Interpretation (New York: Henry Holt, 1937).

²Frances Cooke MacGregor, "Some Psycho-Social Problems Associated with Facial Deformities," Patients, Physicians, and Illness, ed. E. Gartly Jaco (Glencoe:Free Press, 1958), pp. 269-270.

A disability is a condition of impairment, physical or mental, having an objective aspect that can usually be described by a physician A handicap is the cumulative result of the obstacles which disability interposes between the individual and his maximum functional level.¹

A person may be physically impaired without being socially disadvantaged. Whether a disability is actually handicapping is likely to depend upon the combination of other variables involved, such as physical limitations, visibility, stigma, and labelling.

While the disability may hinder the performance of normal everyday tasks, it is the handicap that impedes the attainment of goals by interfering with normal social relationships. The handicap is made up of social barriers which must be surmounted if the person is to be considered fully rehabilitated.

Three kinds of disabilities are ordinarily distinguished: physical, emotional, and mental. This study, however, focuses exclusively upon permanent physical disabilities.

A handicap is a condition of social action, and may be viewed conceptually from several viewpoints.

A disability may be a private category or a social status, depending in large part upon the visibility and stigma of the impairment. As a visible or otherwise apparent social status, disability is often the basis for stigma. Goffman describes a stigmatized person as:

¹Kenneth W. Hamilton, Counseling the Handicapped in the Rehabilitation Process (New York: Ronald Press, 1950), p. 17.

An individual who might have been received easily in ordinary social intercourse possesses a trait that can obtrude itself upon attention and turn those of us whom he meets away from him, breaking the claim that his other attributes have on us By definition, of course, we believe that the person with a stigma is not quite human We tend to impute a wide range of imperfections on the basis of the original one

The disabled are subject to "a special discrepancy between virtual and actual social identity" because they possess an attribute that is "deeply discrediting."² The flow of social communication between the disabled and the non-disabled is impaired because the stigma tends to violate the etiquette of social communication. The imputation that the disabled person is not normal "usually expresses itself in a pronounced stickiness of interactional flow and in the embarrassment of the normal by which he conveys the all too obvious message that he is having difficulty in relating to the handicapped person."³ The disability impinges upon interaction by its potential for becoming a focal point of communication. At worst, the relationship may deteriorate to the point of asymmetry where it becomes an uncomfortable acting out of superior and inferior roles. This may be accompanied "by one or more of the familiar signs of discomfort and stickiness: the guarded references, the common everyday words suddenly made taboo,

¹Erving Goffman, Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1963), p. 5.

²Ibid, p. 3.

³Fred Davis, "Deviance Disavowal: The Management of Strained Interaction by the Visibly Handicapped," Social Problems, 9 (Fall, 1961), pp. 121-122. See also Robert Kleck, "Emotional Arousals in Interactions With Stigmatized Persons," Psychological Reports, 19 (1966), p. 1226.

the fixed stares elsewhere, the artificial levity, the compulsive loquaciousness, the awkward solemnity."¹ Stigma is a standard response to that which is considered deviant.

Although the concept of deviance is usually applied to voluntary behavior, it is a useful tool for analyzing certain kinds of involuntary attributes which violate institutionalized expectations. Like deviant behavior, the imputation of deviant attributes is a social fact, and one which is culturally and historically variable. However, the norms that are violated in the case of deviant physical attributes are relatively ambiguous: they involve idealized constructs of health, abilities, appearance, and behavior. Moreover, deviant subcultures organized to legitimize these attributes or to endow them with ideologies seldom exist. Visible disabilities may be labelled as deviant, whereas those that are not visible or easily perceived are more likely to escape this definition, since it is dependent upon social responses.

Because of their disadvantaged status, the disabled are sometimes compared with racial minority groups.² Like members of minority groups, their opportunity structures are sharply narrowed, and they are subject to both prejudice and stereotypes. However, since physical disabilities are not usually inherited, opportunities for association with similarly situated others are greatly reduced. Even when they do

¹Davis, p. 123.

²Sidney Jordan, "The Disadvantaged Group: A Concept Applicable to the Handicapped," The Journal of Psychology, 55 (1963), pp. 313-322. See also Paul H. Mussen and Roger G. Barker, "Attitudes Towards Cripples," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 39 (1944), pp. 351-355; Lee Myersohn, "Physical Disability as a Social Psychological Problem," Journal of Social Issues, 4 (Fall, 1948), pp. 2-10; and Beatrice A. Wright, Physical Disability: A Psychological Approach (New York: Harper, 1960).

exist, group pride is not likely to be fostered.

The ultimate goal of rehabilitation is to minimize the handicapping consequences of the disability and thereby conserve human resources. The over-all adjustment of the person to his disability is clearly the official goal of all public and private rehabilitation agencies. The aim is to guide the person through the necessary phases of medical treatment and therapy to the point where he is able to function at his optimum level and where he can function as a participating and productive member of society, given the constraints imposed by the disability. Rehabilitation may be viewed as a socialization process into a role in which the handicapping aspects of the disability are minimized. It represents a possible change in the opportunity structure for those who are exposed to it.

The emphasis in this process, however, has been in the direction of vocational rehabilitation: the return of the disabled individual to employment. Krusen defines rehabilitation as "the restoration of the handicapped individual, physically, mentally, socially, and vocationally to the fullest extent compatible with his disabilities and abilities."¹ This orientation is largely the product of massive federal participation in the area of rehabilitation. Eligibility for the programs under the Vocational Rehabilitation Act is restricted to those whose vocational potential is expected to increase as a result of rehabilitation services. The Office of Vocational Rehabilitation was established in 1920 to aid the veterans of the first World War. Since that

¹Frank H. Krusen, Concepts in Rehabilitation of the Handicapped (Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders and Co., 1964), p. 8.

time its services have been greatly expanded, so that the Social and Vocational Service today aids the civilian disabled as well as the war disabled, and the physically, emotionally, and mentally disabled. Efforts are now being made to service the socially disadvantaged as well. An indicator of the importance attached to the vocational component of rehabilitation is the annual reporting by the Social and Vocational Service of the number of people who have been "rehabilitated into employment." The original Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1920 defined rehabilitation as "the rendering of a person disabled fit to engage in a remunerative occupation."¹ The cost-accounting approach is evident in the statement that "it has been carefully calculated that for each dollar spent by the Federal Government in its joint programs with the states, the rehabilitated man or woman will pay back at least five dollars in Federal income taxes alone during the remainder of his work years."² In analyzing the government's involvement, Straus found that the programs have been dominated by a utilitarian goal of productivity, with eligibility for rehabilitation benefits rigidly linked with the potential for employment.³

The rehabilitation process attempts to restore the individual to a maximum level of vocational functioning, within the limitations imposed by the disability itself. Toward this end, the client is provided with appropriate medical, psychological, social, and vocational services.

¹Quoted in Richard D. Burk, "The Nature of Disability," Journal of Rehabilitation, 33 (November-December, 1967), p. 11.

²Julietta K. Arthur, Employment for the Handicapped (New York: Abingdon Press, 1967), p. 26.

³Robert Straus, "Social Change and the Rehabilitation Concept," Sociology and Rehabilitation, ed. Marvin B. Sussman (Washington, D.C.: American Sociological Association, 1966), pp. 1-34.

If it is accepted that the purpose of rehabilitation is to return the individual to suitable employment, then job placement is the final step in this process. However, securing a job is not identical with vocational success. The social existence of the disability does not disappear once job placement is achieved; the handicap itself may well play a significant role in the person's occupational career. Virtually no research into the occupational careers of the disabled has yet been attempted. Such factors as maintenance of employment, salary, advancement, job satisfaction, and the structural blocks to these achievements must be considered. This is the rationale leading to a follow-up study of job placement.

Vocational Achievement: The Dependent Variable

What is meant here by vocational achievement is the ability to function in the occupational sphere in such a way as to maximize rewards, given the limitations imposed by the disabled status. Rewards in this sense include both socio-economic returns and social-psychological satisfactions. The physically disabled person, like the non-disabled person, requires as a result of his vocational endeavors certain amounts of financial remuneration and recognition.

The vocational achievements of the physically disabled, and especially of those who are undereducated, clearly are not directly comparable with those of the non-disabled. Although occupations in American society are in principle achieved roles, open to anyone with objective qualifications, it is well known that this principle is frequently violated. The disabled person without a high school diploma lacks two essential elements of the passport to job success. As a result of these disadvantaged statuses, expectations, aspirations, and opportunity structures are substantially reduced.

For tabulation purposes, it was necessary to combine the variables into an index. The base line for changes is the final placement by the sponsoring agency, rather than the onset of the disability or some period of time before the disability began. This is largely a function of the difficulties involved in asking the respondents to recall details of jobs held in the past: sixty-five percent became disabled more than ten years prior to the follow-up interview. When operationalized, this concept approaches the idea of employment success over time in comparison with others placed by the sponsoring agency during the same period, although the disabilities themselves are not directly comparable. Moreover, the respondents at the same time are competing with their own initial level at the time of placement.

Given the fact that fully twenty-eight percent were unemployed at follow-up, simple employment or unemployment was logically the first step toward measuring vocational achievement. In addition to employment status, it seemed important to consider major changes in job level since placement as well as changes in weekly salary. About one-third of the respondents received weekly salary increases of \$10 or less since placement, one-third of \$11 to \$30, and one-third of \$31 or more. Given the restricted nature of the population, a simple measure of changes in job level since placement was used. Only changes between major occupational groupings were considered; that is, unskilled manual, skilled manual, clerical and sales, and white-collar/quasi-professional. The white-collar group was the most stable over time and the unskilled manual group was the least stable.

The final measure of vocational achievement includes rate of salary and level change for those respondents employed at follow-up, and voluntary and involuntary labor force status for those unemployed at follow-up.

The respondents are divided into six groups: those who are "most successful," "somewhat successful," "least successful," unemployed and in the labor force, unemployed and voluntarily out of the labor force, unemployed and involuntarily out of the labor force.¹

In order to rate salary progression, for each of the eight years the data were first subdivided into three equal groups of most, somewhat, and least successful. The groups were then examined to ensure that no two people with the same salary change were placed in different categories. Ties were assigned to the medium group.

The index of vocational achievement is primarily based upon the relative salary progression experienced by the disabled person in comparison with his disabled peers. It is then adjusted to reflect whether or not the person rose into a higher occupational level (for example, a change from an unskilled manual position to a skilled manual position), or fell into a lower occupational category. For example, a person whose raises placed him in the middle salary progression group for those placed in his year, but whose occupational level had shifted upward from clerical work to supervisory work, would be put into the next highest category.

¹Eight people, for whom a minimum of twelve months had not passed from placement to interview were eliminated from the index; it was assumed that they had not had sufficient time in which to compete with others placed in that year. Seven of these eight would have fallen into the "least successful" group.

Hypotheses

A number of hypotheses were formulated concerning the factors likely to be associated with vocational achievement. The sources of these hypotheses include sociological theory, rehabilitation literature, and first-hand experience with the data. Some of these hypotheses can be considered demographic and others are related to the nature of the disability itself. The third set consists of occupational conditions and behaviors.

The demographic factors hypothesized to be related to vocational achievement are:

Sex: men should be more successful, since disabled women can more readily legitimize unemployment or marginal employment, and since women are more likely to be discriminated against in the allocation of raises and promotions.

Race: whites should be more successful, since discrimination in employment practices is expected to apply to the non-white disabled at least as much as it applies to the non-white non-disabled.

Age: the young should be more successful, since they are more likely to be less severely disabled and most skilled in new industrial techniques.

Socio-economic status: those higher in socio-economic status should be more successful, since the components of the index of socio-economic status are likely to be associated with the components of the index of vocational achievement.

The disability-related factors hypothesized to be related to vocational achievement are:

Age when disabled: those disabled when relatively young should

be more successful, since fewer occupational plans were disrupted by the onset of the disability.

The visibility and stigma of the disability: those with non-visible or nonstigmatized disabilities should be more successful, since they are less likely to encounter discrimination in employment practices.

The severity of the disability: those with the least severe disabilities should be more successful, since the impairment is less likely to impinge upon their work abilities or performances.

Whether special training to acquire new skills was undertaken: those who acquired such training should be more successful, especially those who can no longer pursue their usual line of work due to the disruption of their careers by the onset of the disability.

The job-related factors hypothesized to be related to vocational achievement are:

Job interest at intake: those who aspired at that time to white-collar jobs should be more successful, since these jobs do not require physical exertion and since they are higher in the occupational prestige system.

Job-finding channels: those who used formal channels should be more successful than those who used informal channels, since formal means of job-seeking are likely to result in a better congruence of man and job.

Voluntary disclosure of the disability: those who disclose the disability to potential employers should be more successful, since they exhibit greater realism in job searches and since they are less likely to encounter future difficulties in this area.

Job requirements: those who had specific job requirements which were met should be more successful, since they are likely to be more

purposeful in their job searches and to be more satisfied with the jobs received.

Job level: those in white-collar jobs at follow-up should be more successful than those in blue-collar jobs, since the disability is less apt to impinge upon white-collar jobs, and the jobs are likely to be associated with greater job satisfaction in light of the system of occupational rewards and prestige.

Vocational self-image: those with positive vocational self-images should be more successful, since self-expectations are likely to coincide with behavior.

Need to work: those who feel they must work, because of financial need or social norms, should be more successful, since perceived pressures are likely to result in action.

Placement-related factors: those who had "successful" placements by the sponsoring agency, in terms of such factors as job level and job salary should be more successful, since success is more likely to be continued than reversed.

Disability-related factors: those who experienced the fewest vocational changes by the onset of the disability, in terms of the nature of employment, the place of employment, and salary should be more successful, since the impact of the disability upon career patterns is likely to be less critical.

CHAPTER III

THE POPULATIONThe Research Site

Just One Break, Inc. is a private, non-profit employment agency located in New York City which places the physically disabled in full time competitive employment. Founded in 1949 as a response to the problems of disabled veterans returning from the War, J. O. B. has subsequently expanded to serve all permanently disabled men and women in the New York Metropolitan area.

Most applicants are referred to J.O.B. by doctors, hospitals, and a wide variety of public and private agencies. Others are self-referrals, having been informed of J.O.B.'s services through less formal channels, including advertising. All applicants must have medical clearance for full time work. Their previous contacts in the field of rehabilitation run the gamut from federal, state, and private agencies to no contact at all.

This agency offers selective placement by carefully matching the applicant with the job for which he is physically and vocationally qualified. Skilled placement specialists provide thorough employment evaluations of each applicant in the course of unstructured and focused interviews which last several hours. No fee is charged to either employer or employee.

The wide variety of applicants serviced by this agency and the

broad range of disabilities assure that the findings of this study will be relevant to those concerned with vocational rehabilitation.

Population - An Empirical Definition

The total number of actions taken by Just One Break between 1960 and 1967 were 4744. Of these:

719 people constitute the population because they had completed fewer than twelve years of formal education and had been "serviced." By "serviced" is meant aid in securing placement. Those who are said to have been "placed" found jobs as a direct result of their contact with J.O.B. Those designated as "working" found jobs while they were registered with the agency, but not necessarily as a direct result of its efforts. The "working" group is included because it is not always clear to what extent the applicant was helped by the agency. It is J.O.B.'s policy to encourage all applicants to actively seek jobs on their own. Moreover, twenty-one percent of all those whose placements were in the "working" category had previously been placed directly. (Eleven percent of those whose placements were direct had previously been placed indirectly.)

57 people were removed from the population because participation in a normal interviewing situation was expected to be exceedingly difficult or impossible as a result of communication problems. These are cases for which the normal assumptions of interviewing in social research do not hold.

They include:

- a) The deaf who are unable to read lips or to speak intelligibly.....N = 34
- b) Deaf-mutes.....N = 10
- c) Those whose disabilities severely affect their speech.....N = 7
- d) Those institutionalized as a result of senility or mental illness.....N = 3
- e) Those who do not speak English.....N = 3

7 people were removed from the population because their cases were reactivated in the three-month period between the time the sampling was begun and the letters were mailed.

1097 people were eliminated because they had completed more than twelve years of formal education, although they had been serviced. These people were removed to emphasize those who are likely to have the most difficulty in the labor force. This permits focusing upon a disabled segment of the under-class of American society.

2864 people were eliminated because their cases were "closed" rather than "serviced." These people were removed because they were too heterogeneous to be systematically studied. Reasons for closure included lack of contact, poor motivation as perceived and documented by the placement interviewer, temporary or extended illness, moving outside the New York Metropolitan Area, death, voluntary closure by the applicant, and unrealistic employment goals.

The date of the final contact with the agency was taken as the basis for determining eligibility by time. It is not uncommon for people to return for aid in securing other positions. For the eight-year period covered, there were 3102 services rendered, but 1880 actual people involved; the average person applied for employment services 1.6 times.

Of the 1816 serviced cases, excluding those with communication problems and those who were reactivated, forty percent were eligible for the population because they had not graduated from high school. Among the serviced cases, there were no patterned differences of educational achievement over time. Among the closed cases, however, there was a tendency for the educational achievement of the group as a whole to increase over time. Forty-nine percent of the closed cases had not completed high school, compared with forty percent of the serviced cases.

Among the serviced and closed cases with more than twelve years of schooling, there are no significant differences for either educational achievement beyond high school or sex. As expected, men tend to be better educated than women in both types of cases.

After the 2864 closed cases were reviewed to determine educational achievement, detailed case notes were taken on the 1394 people with fewer than twelve years of education who would have been eligible for the population if they had been serviced rather than closed.

It was expected that a comparison of the population to the cases which were closed would produce an empirical definition of the population.

It was expected that the closed cases, as a whole, would be more severely disadvantaged and therefore would be clearly distinct from those who could be aided in obtaining employment. The following hypotheses were formulated:

a) The closed cases would be socially disadvantaged. Indicators include a higher proportion who were non-white, older and unmarried. These differences were found to hold only for marital status: forty-six percent of the closed cases, compared with fifty-three percent of the serviced cases, were married at intake.

b) The closed cases would be economically disadvantaged. Indicators include greater unemployment prior to coming to the agency, not having their own telephones, and source of financial support when unemployed. Fifty-six percent of the closed cases, compared with forty-six percent of the serviced cases, were unemployed for ten months or more before registering with the agency. Twenty-nine percent of the closed cases, against seventeen percent of the serviced cases, did not have their own telephones. No differences were found for source of support when unemployed.

c) The closed cases would be occupationally disadvantaged. Indicators are relative lack of skills and a low level of job interest. This was upheld by the data: forty-two percent of the closed cases were unskilled at intake, versus thirty-two percent of the serviced cases.

d) The closed cases would be more severely disabled. Rough indicators of severity that could be applied to the limited data available for the closed cases are the number of disabilities, medical prognosis, and whether physical mobility was affected by the disability. The closed cases were more likely than the serviced cases to have unfavorable medical prognoses (twenty-seven percent versus sixteen percent). There were no differences in the proportion of cases in which physical mobility was affected,

and the serviced cases actually tended to have a greater number of disabilities than the closed cases. This is not surprising, however, since the information was gathered at different points in time, allowing the respondents to accumulate additional disabilities; the greater amount of probing about the nature of the disability in the interview situation permitted additional disabilities to emerge.

Five other expected differences were found between the closed and serviced cases. More time elapsed between intake and "final action" for the closed cases than the serviced cases; this may have resulted from fifty-three percent of these cases having been closed because of lack of contact. The closed cases visited fewer rehabilitation agencies than did the serviced cases. That thirty-six percent were closed for such reasons as lack of motivation, emotional problems, and unrealistic goals also helps explain this relative lack of contact with other agencies. The closed cases also had fewer "final actions" than the serviced cases. Behavior at the interview also distinguishes these two types of cases. The closed cases were more likely to wear blue-collar dress. Their desire to secure employment was lower than for the serviced cases, according to the placement interviewer.

No differences were found between the closed and serviced cases with respect to the following variables: sex, number of dependents, borough of residence, years elapsed since coming to the agency, minimum salary desired, the involvement of communication in the disability, cause of disability, and age at the onset of disability.

Although the indicators of disadvantage were not uniformly upheld, the hypothesis that the closed cases would be more severely disadvantaged than the serviced cases was in general substantiated. The closed cases

are clearly more economically and occupationally disadvantaged. The findings concerning social disadvantage are uncertain, and those concerning physical disadvantage are likely to have been contaminated by the time gap in obtaining the data.

Characteristics of the Respondents

The respondents consist of the 389 people serviced by the sponsoring agency between 1960 and 1967 who had completed fewer than twelve years of formal education.¹ This section describes some of their general characteristics.

Sixty-eight percent of the respondents were men.² This disproportionate representation is not surprising, since men, especially disabled men, are more likely than women to be in the labor force. Those not in the labor force at follow-up were in the labor force when they first applied to the agency.

Seventy-seven percent of the respondents were white.³ Non-whites are more frequently disabled than whites, and therefore should be heavily represented among the respondents. That this is not the case suggests that the reduced opportunity structures of the non-whites operate to limit their searches for aid in obtaining employment if they are disabled.

Since the prevalence of disabilities is strongly associated with age, it was not surprising to find that more than half of the respondents were older than age fifty; about one-fifth were younger than forty.⁴

¹ Among the population that could not be interviewed, 159 could not be located, 52 refused to be interviewed, 41 were deceased, and 21 had moved too far from the New York Metropolitan Area to be interviewed.

² Q.14 (to interviewer): "Sex of respondent . . ."

³ Q.15 (to interviewer): "Race of respondent . . ."

⁴ Q.124: "In what year were you born?"

Although by definition the respondents were not well educated, they were clustered in the group that had begun but not completed high school. Thirteen percent had fewer than eight years of education, twenty percent completed grammar school, and sixty-five percent began high school.¹ Eight people had continued their formal educations since their last contact with the agency.

Twenty percent of the respondents were born outside this country (six percent in South America and fourteen percent in Europe or the Soviet Union). Twelve percent were born in the South. Fifty-eight percent were born in New York City; of these, more than one-third resided at the time of the interview in the borough in which they had been born.²

Fifty-five percent of the respondents were married at follow-up.³ Twenty-one percent were single, and twenty-four percent were separated, divorced, or widowed.

Given the educational and physical stratification of the population, it was not surprising to find that the respondents' family incomes were heavily distributed in the lowest income categories.⁴ Twenty percent had annual family incomes below \$3,000, forty-four percent were between \$3,000 and \$6,999, and thirty-five percent were above \$7,000.

¹Q.128: "What was the highest degree of school that you completed?" (Only formal education is included.)

²Q.125: "Where were you born?," compared with current address.

³Q.4: "Are you married, single, separated, divorced, or widowed?"

⁴Q.139: "Can you tell me what category your total family income was in last year?" (Card was used.)

Seventy-two percent of the respondents were employed at follow-up. Among those who were unemployed, thirty-two percent were in the labor force and actively seeking work, forty-four percent were involuntarily out of the labor force because they were too sick or had given up looking for work, and twenty-four percent were voluntarily out of the labor force because they were retired, housewives, in training, or had taken temporary breaks from work.¹

Twenty-nine percent of the respondents were in unskilled manual positions at follow-up, twenty-two percent in skilled manual positions, and forty-eight percent had clerical or white-collar jobs. Only seven percent of those employed at follow-up had any unemployment experiences during the ten months preceding the interview.

Among those employed at follow-up, fourteen percent were working in factories, thirty percent in blue-collar industries, thirty percent in white-collar businesses, seven percent for the government, sixteen percent for other non-profit firms, and three percent were self-employed.² More than four out of five had been with their firms for at least one year.³

Twenty-one percent had received promotions since beginning their current job. Fully forty-eight percent were in positions where they did

¹Q.36: "Do you have a job now?" (IF NO): Q.37: "Are you looking for work now?" (IF NO): Q.46: "Can you tell me why you're not looking for work now?"

²Q.55: "Where are you working?"

³Q.57: "When did you start working there?"

not perceive promotions to be possible. Of those who did not receive any promotions, only nine percent felt that they deserved any.¹ Twenty-six percent felt they were qualified for future promotions.² The disabled status evidently reduces expectations and aspirations in addition to opportunity structures.

Eighty-five percent received raises since beginning this job, and twenty-eight percent of those who did not receive raises felt they had been deserved.³ Seventeen percent thought they had received more raises than others in their companies, and six percent thought they had received fewer raises.⁴ Weekly salaries for those employed at follow-up were distributed as follows: eighteen percent earned less than \$70, thirty-one percent earned between \$71 and \$90, twenty-four percent earned between \$91 and \$110, and twenty-seven percent earned \$111 or more.⁵

Sixteen percent were absent from work for more than two weeks during the six months preceding the interview.⁶ Only eight percent expected

¹Q.73: "Since you started this job, have you had any promotions?"
(IF NO): "Do you think you deserved any promotions? Why? (Why not?)"

²Q.75: "Do you think you will get a promotion (again) when it is your turn?"

³Q.70: "Have you had any raises since then?" (IF NO): "Do you think you deserved any raises?"

⁴Q.70c: "Compared with other people in your company with the same kind of job and about the same experience, would you say you've had more raises, fewer raises, or about the same number of raises?"

⁵Q.71: "And what is your salary now?" (Before deductions.)

⁶Q.76: "Have you been absent from work at all during the past six months?" (IF YES): "How often were you absent?"

to leave their jobs as soon as possible, and sixty-eight percent expected to stay as long as possible or until retirement.¹ However, only fifty-seven percent thought they were qualified to do a different type of work than they were then doing.²

One-third of the respondents voluntarily mentioned sometime during the interview that they were handicapped in obtaining employment. More than half of those employed had applied for other jobs before receiving this one, and almost sixty percent accepted this job because of desperation or lack of choice.³ Although seventy-four percent revealed their disabilities to potential employers,⁴ seventy-one percent of these people had disabilities which were at least partially visible. Fifty-eight percent of those who did not inform employers explained by saying they would not otherwise be hired. Twenty-eight percent found their current job through the sponsoring agency. Other sources included rehabilitation and poverty agencies (22 percent), informal contacts (21 percent), employment agencies (17 percent), newspapers (9 percent) and direct contact (8 percent).⁵

¹Q.78: "How long do you expect to stay with this company?"

²Q.80: "Besides the job you have now could you tell me any other kinds of work you feel you could do?"

³Q.88: "Why did you finally take this job?"

⁴Q.90: "When you are looking for work, do you tell employers about your disability? Why? (Why not?)"

⁵Q.85: "Can you tell me how you found this job?"

Forty-one percent of the respondents had only one disability, thirty-seven percent had two disabilities, and twenty-two percent had three or more disabilities. In terms of origin, twenty percent were caused by disease, twenty-two percent by accident, ten percent were congenital, six percent were service-connected, and forty-two percent were not known. Thirty-five percent of the respondents became disabled before the age of eighteen, thirty-five percent between the ages of nineteen and forty-four, and thirty percent after the age of forty-five. Almost half of the respondents had been disabled for at least sixteen years prior to the interview.

According to an index of relative severity constructed for these respondents, eighteen percent were very severely disabled and thirty percent were only moderately disabled. Twenty percent mentioned pain sometime during the interview, and twenty-six percent mentioned discomfort. Physical mobility was involved for fifty-three percent, and thirty-one percent stated that they had difficulty using public transportation because of their disabilities. Communication was affected for thirteen percent.¹ Twenty-seven percent were afflicted with chain disabilities and forty-nine percent received medical attention for their disabilities in the year preceding the interview.²

Just half of the respondents had disabilities which were highly visible; fourteen percent were moderately visible, and thirty-six percent were not visible at all.³

¹Fifty-seven people had been removed from the population because of their inability to participate in a normal interviewing situation.

²Q.11a: "Did you see a doctor about this, or anything else, during the past year?" (The condition was probed if the response was affirmative.)

³Q.3-6 (to interviewer): "Is disability _____ visible to a passing stranger? Is this disability visible to you?"

Applicants are referred to the agency by a wide variety of public and private agencies. Twenty-three percent were referred by the New York State Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, and thirty-six percent were self-referrals.

Fully eighty-nine percent of the respondents had at least some contact with agencies designed to aid the disabled by providing physical therapy, personal counseling, or help in obtaining employment. Thirty-five percent had visited one agency other than J.O.B., twenty-eight percent visited two other agencies, sixteen percent visited three other agencies, ten percent visited four other agencies, and eleven percent visited no other agency. All knew of the existence of such agencies; if this was not the case prior to coming to the agency, it was after their contact. These data document the process of labelling by status-judges, or at least the potential for this process, and indicate its effect upon the behaviors, if not the life styles, of incumbents of the disabled status. Unfortunately, the point in time at which this labelling took place cannot be ascertained from the interview schedule.

Fifty-four percent of the respondents had registered at some point with the New York State Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. This is one of the many rehabilitation agencies which offer training programs or sponsor training at certified schools for people who can no longer pursue their previous line of work or wish to acquire marketable skills. (Forty-five percent of the respondents could no longer do the kind of work they did before becoming disabled, and twenty percent were unskilled before

becoming disabled.) Sixty-one percent actually received such training. Of these people, forty-three percent were sponsored by the New York State Division of Vocational Rehabilitation, forty-seven percent by other rehabilitation agencies, and nine percent had self-sponsored training.¹

¹The effects of these training programs upon vocational achievement are examined in Chapter V.

CHAPTER IV

PROCEDURESPilot Study

A one year pilot study was undertaken in 1966 to assess the feasibility of this study.¹ The previous researcher interviewed rehabilitation personnel to learn the most pressing informational gaps. To generate hypotheses, twenty-five focused and open-ended interviews were held with a judgmentally-selected sample of the agency's clients, chosen to maximize the range of experiences reported.

To determine if those placed by the agency could be contacted, a random sample of 159 applicants were contacted by mail and requested to indicate their current address and employment status on a self-addressed postcard so that the files could be updated. The twenty-nine percent response rate to that mailing was considered adequate, since the sample included applicants from 1954 rather than from 1960, as in this study. Additional attempts to contact non-respondents were not made, and respondents were not compensated for their cooperation.

¹This initial investigation was supported, in part, by Research Grant #RD-2305-G from the Vocational and Rehabilitation Administration, Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Washington, D. C.

Development of the Interview Schedule

After reviewing the relevant literature, consulting with professionals in rehabilitation, and considering the results of the pilot study, the interview schedule was developed. Pretests were conducted with recent and active applicants of the agency. After six such interviews were completed, it was clear that no new dimensions were being suggested and that almost all changes involved simplification of terminology. The pretests were therefore terminated, since it was apparent that additional pretesting would yield no new areas to be tapped. This lack of feedback and stimulation appears to be a function of both the stratification of the population by educational achievement and the negative social correlates of the disabled status.

Selection of the Population

The second stage involved selecting the population eligible to be interviewed. The case records of all 1816 people serviced by J.O.B. for the eight-year period from 1960 through 1967 were read, and relevant information was transferred onto "sample cards" specifically designed for this study. These cards provide systematic records for each applicant's contacts with the agency, including the structured records recorded by the intake coordinator and the relatively unstructured case notes of the placement interviewer. These data were coded into such relevant categories as sex, age, race, level of education, number and types of disabilities, medical prognosis, motivation to work, and job interest.

Contacting the Population

A letter was sent to those eligible to be interviewed, as a result of having completed fewer than twelve years of formal education, inviting them to participate in the study. The letter explained that the sponsoring agency had been requested by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare to study what had happened to the people it had placed in the past few years. It was stressed that their information would be held in the strictest confidence. In addition, the subjects were offered five dollars for their time and cooperation.¹ They were told that the interview could be arranged almost anytime and anywhere at their convenience: in their homes, at their places of business, or at the agency's office in New York. A postcard was included on which they were to indicate the place and time most convenient for them.

It was hoped that the combination of money, effort, and previous contact with the sponsoring agency would reduce the number of refusals. After the first letter was sent, if there was no response by either telephone or mail for approximately two weeks, a second letter was sent. The same period of time was again allowed before a third letter was sent. Those who still remained were contacted by telephone, and then by telegram if necessary.

A number of letters were returned because the subjects no longer resided at their former addresses. Determined efforts were made to locate these people, so that the data would not be biased by a low response rate.

¹Because this is a relatively homogeneous population, the standard objections to paying respondents for their cooperation appear not to hold.

The original case records were checked for clues. When possible, contact was made with the last known employer and with other agencies which had serviced these people. Extensive use was made of telephone directories. Approximately eighty respondents who otherwise would have been lost were located by these searching porcedures.

Upon receipt of the postcard or other indication that the person preferred to be interviewed in his home or at his place of business, the case was assigned to a field interviewer who arranged the appointment. Cases were assigned according to the borough in which the respondent resided, with the exception that black respondents were matched with a black interviewer. This resulted in cost reductions as well as ease of administration.

The interviewers were alerted to certain characteristics of the respondents in advance, in order to avoid situations of discomfort or embarrassment. The "contact cards" they received listed the name, address, telephone number, age, disabilities, and the nature of placement. This advance notice also enabled the interviewers to use leading probes when necessary for secondary disabilities.

A total of 389 interviews were completed between July, 1968 and April, 1969. One-third of the respondents were interviewed at the agency's office by the study director and her assistant. The average interviewing time was two hours.

Those who were unemployed at the time of the interview tended to be interviewed earlier than those who were employed. This may be related to their desire to use the agency's placement services again, although there was only a slight tendency for the unemployed to come to the office for the interview rather than being interviewed in their homes. It may

also be related to their having more time available for the interview.

By and large, the respondents were most cooperative and even enthusiastic about being interviewed. Many who came to the office for the interview explained that they wanted to save us the trouble of going to their homes.

Training of Interviewers

Ten interviewers were hired to administer the schedules in the field. The National Opinion Research Center was helpful in referring six of their interviewers who had been trained and employed by them for at least four years. All of the interviewers were female. Eight of the ten were married. Their average age was forty-four, and they had completed an average of fifteen years of formal education.

Each interviewer completed one such interview with the study director, who played the role of a resentful and recalcitrant respondent. They were given close supervision in the field. Each was paid five dollars per hour for her interviewing and editing time; an amount deliberately above the "going rate" was offered to attract experienced and competent people.

Validation Procedures

The schedules were edited by the interviewers for completeness and legibility. They were edited and coded by the study director as soon after their receipt as possible. When necessary, respondents and interviewers were contacted for clarification or completeness.

Since certain pertinent background information was available for each respondent from the "sample card," the completed questionnaires were

easily validated. When questions arose as to their validity, the respondents were contacted for confirmation of the interview and the specific information. No invalid questionnaires were discovered this way, although it was necessary to terminate two interviews: one applicant who visited the agency's office clearly was unable to communicate, and another refused to continue the interview in the field after the first few pages. Non-suspect interviews were also spot-checked for confirmation.

The following procedures were utilized to reduce processing errors:

- All coding of the questionnaires was done by the study director alone.
- Substantial recoding was carried out, especially for the schedules which were first coded.
- A sample of the schedules was independently recoded to assure the replicability of the coding instructions.
- The cards were sorted by machine to eliminate illegal columns, illegal codes, and logical contradictions. The complete card was recoded when errors of these types were discovered.

Criteria for Significance and Methods of Analysis

Two criteria for testing the significance of findings are used throughout the analysis: there must be a percentage difference of at least ten points between variables for one or more category, and the tables must be statistically significant at the .10 level or better, using the Chi Square test. The Chi Square test cannot be interpreted in the usual manner, since its purpose is to give the probability that the findings for an entire population would be different from those for a random sample drawn from that population. In this case, the entire

population is included in the "sample," and the sample differs from the population only because part of the population could not be interviewed. Chi Square and level of significance are used to give a sense of the relative strength of the associations among different sets of variables, and to provide constant and objective criteria for evaluating relationships as "significant" and worthy of inclusion.

Multivariate analysis refers to the systematic introduction of additional variables to test simple relationships between two variables.¹ It consists of the simultaneous examination of three or more variables. Given the restricted size of this population, it was seldom possible to examine the simultaneous interrelationships of more than three variables. The logic behind this mode of analysis is first to test the data for spuriousness and then to refine its meaning.

"Explanation" refers to the discovery of spurious relationships which "explain away" the initial finding. The problem is whether the initial association implies a "causal" connection between the two variables, in whether it is instead dependent upon invalidating factors which precede the independent variable in time. To test for this, additional variables which are extrinsic to the original independent variable, are introduced into the analysis. The procedure is to control or hold constant possibly invalidating factors.

"Interpretation," on the other hand, involves elaborating the data by discovering intervening variables which link the original variables and reveal how the results were produced.

In "explanation" and "interpretation" the test factors are related

¹Paul F. Lazarsfeld, "Evidence and Inference in Social Research," *Dialectica*, 87 (1938), pp. 117-124. See also Paul F. Lazarsfeld, "Interpretation of Statistical Relations as a Research Operation," *The Language of Social Research*, ed. Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Morris Rosenberg (Glencoe: Free Press, 1933), pp. 111-123, and Herbert Hyman, *Survey Design and Analysis* (New York: Free Press, 1933), pp. 241-249.

to both the original independent and dependent variables, and the resulting partial associations are smaller than the original association. When the values of the test factor are held constant, the association between the independent and dependent variables should disappear, since the test factor explains or interprets the original relationship. In practice, however, it is more likely that the partials will be reduced. The difference between the two modes of analysis rests on the time order of the test factors. In explanation, the test factor is antecedent; in interpretation, it is intervening.

A third mode of multivariate analysis is the discovery of factors which "specify" the original relationship. The interest is in the relative size of the partial relationships and in the conditions under which the original relationship is intensified or diminished. Specification refers to discovering the conditions or contingencies under which the initial association is enhanced in one category of the test variable, or reduced in the other. If the test factor is antecedent to the independent variable, a "condition" has been revealed; if it is intervening between the independent and dependent variables, a "contingency" has been revealed. In specified relationships, the test variable is unrelated to one or both of the original variables.

The outcomes of multivariate analysis are presented below:

<u>INTEREST IN:</u>	<u>TIME ORDER OF TEST FACTOR</u>	
	<u>Antecedent</u>	<u>Intervening</u>
<u>Marginals</u>	Explanation	Interpretation
<u>Partials</u>	Specification (Condition)	Specification (Contingency)

Because of limitations of space, the actual tables are discussed, but not presented, in the following chapter. These tables are available upon request from the sponsoring agency.

CHAPTER V

DEMOGRAPHIC FACTORS RELATED TO VOCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENTSex

It was hypothesized that men would be more successful than women in the labor market, since disabled women can more readily legitimize unemployment or marginal employment. A woman who is disabled is less likely to feel that she must work, given the expectations about the roles of men and women in this society. Women may also be discriminated against in the allocation of raises and promotions. This was borne out by the data. Thirty-one percent of the men, compared with sixteen percent of the women, were "most successful" in their careers from the time of placement to follow-up. By contrast, only eighteen percent of the men, against twenty-eight percent of the women, were "least successful."¹ There were no real differences between the sexes by employment or unemployment, although there were significant differences according to the degree

¹The findings in the literature concerning the relationship between sex and employment status are mixed. McPhee, in studying the emotionally and physically disabled who were serviced by the Utah, Montana, and Wyoming Divisions of Vocational Rehabilitation, found that men were more frequently employed at follow-up than women; McPhee, pp. 562-563. Schletzer *et al.*, produced this same finding from a random sample of the national population; Schletzer *et al.*, Factors Related to Employment Success, p.16. Ware interviewed both the physically and mentally disabled who had undergone rehabilitation and found no differences by sex; Ware, p. 517.

of success if they were employed at follow-up.¹

However, it is the men who were best educated who were especially successful in their careers.² When education is introduced as an intervening variable, forty-five percent of the men with eleven or more years of education, against only twenty-two percent of the women with the same level of education, are "most successful." Forty-five percent of the best educated men are most successful, compared with thirty-one percent of the men in general; there is now a percentage difference of twenty-three, compared with fifteen in the original table. Among those with fewer than eight years of education, the difference between the sexes is reduced to seven percent. The association between sex and vocational achievement is contingent upon education. Education specifies, rather than interprets or explains the relationship because there is no association between sex and level of education among these respondents and because sex precedes education in time.

¹Lesser and Darling support this finding of no differences in employment or unemployment by sex in their study of clients serviced by the Institute for the Crippled and Disabled during the 1940s. They removed from their sample women who were voluntarily out of the labor force. When the thirteen women voluntarily not in the labor force were removed from these data, employed men continued to advance more rapidly than employed women, and differences in sex by employment status did emerge: twenty-nine percent of the men were unemployed at follow-up, compared with only nineteen percent of the women. (The reasons given for unemployment did not distinguish men from women.) When both men and women voluntarily out of the labor force were eliminated, men were even more likely than before to be disproportionately represented among the unemployed. In sum, men were more successful than women. There are no differences in employment status between the sexes unless those voluntarily out of the labor force are eliminated; in this case, men tended either to be "most successful" or unemployed.

²"What was the highest grade of school that you completed?"

Age also specifies the relationship between sex and vocational success.¹ The relationship is contingent upon being between the ages of eighteen and thirty: men in this age group were far more likely than older men to be most successful. Fifty-two percent of the youngest men were most successful, against only eleven percent of the youngest women. Among those older than fifty, only twenty-one percent of the men and eleven percent of the women were most successful.

When age and education are both held constant, the two variables in combination exercise a cumulative effect upon employment success. The men who were both young and best educated were especially successful in the labor market, while those who were both older and less well educated were much less successful. Sixty percent of the men between the ages of eighteen and forty with eleven years or more of education were most successful, compared with thirty percent of the women with the same characteristics. In contrast, twenty-five percent of the men older than forty-one years of age with fewer than eleven years of education were most successful, compared with twelve percent of the older and less well educated women.

The original relationship is dependent upon the respondents' age at the onset of the disability.² Men who became disabled before the age

¹"In what year were you born?"

²"Can you tell me how this happened?" (Probe for dates or age at onset.)

of forty-five were more likely to be successful than those disabled after this age.¹ Only twenty percent of the men and twelve percent of the women disabled after age forty-five were most successful.

The relationship between sex and vocational achievement is contingent upon the respondent having a disability which is not accompanied by a high degree of stigma.² Among those whose disabilities have low or medium stigma, men are more than twice as likely as women to be "most successful," but there is little difference between the sexes among those with highly stigmatized disabilities. Thirty-five percent of the men with no stigma or low stigma were most successful, compared with fifteen percent of the women. Among those with high stigma, twenty-eight percent of the men and twenty-four percent of the women were most successful.

The relationship is also dependent upon job level at follow-up: men in white-collar jobs were more likely to be successful than those in blue-collar jobs.³ Fifty-five percent of the men in white-collar jobs, versus twenty-three percent of the women, were most successful. In contrast, among those with blue-collar jobs, thirty-eight percent of the men and nineteen percent of the women were most successful.

¹This is one of several instances in which the schema of elaborating multivariate data does not clarify a methodologically confusing situation. Sex is related to age at the onset of the disability (women tended to be disabled at a younger age than men). Although the partials are intensified, as in the case of specification, the interrelationships among the three variables suggests that the finding should be an interpretation rather than a specification. When this type of problem arises, the relationship will be said to be "dependent" upon the test factor.

²Stigma is an objective measure of negative evaluation; the respondents were judgmentally placed in four groups, ranging from no stigma to high stigma.

³"What kind of work do you do there?"

The relationship between sex and job success is contingent upon lengthy on-the-job training.¹ Men who had training on their jobs for seven days or more were most likely to be successful. Lengthy on-the-job training is also associated with vocational success for women, although the relationship is weaker than for men. Sixty-three percent of the men with lengthy on-the-job training were most successful, compared with thirty percent of the women. Among those with no on-the-job training, thirty-nine percent of the men and twenty percent of the women were most successful.

That men are more successful than women is contingent upon socio-economic status: "upper-class" men were most successful, especially when compared with "lower-class" women.² Fifty-six percent of the "upper class" men were most successful, against twenty-three percent of the "upper class" women. Among the "lower class," only ten percent of the men and six percent of the women were most successful.

The introduction of the number of financial dependents, job interest at intake, or whether the respondent worked before becoming disabled did not help to interpret the relationship between sex and employment success. In addition, the relationship is not significantly affected by any of the following variables: education, race, marital status, whether the respondent was labelled as handicapped by others, whether he had been involved in physical therapy, whether formal or informal job-finding channels were used,

¹"Did you receive any on-the-job training?" (IF YES): "How long did this training last?"

²The index of socio-economic status was constructed by considering education, family income, and occupation of the head of the household.

or whether special training to acquire new skills was undertaken after the onset of the disability.

To sum up the results of the multivariate analysis, the finding that men exceed women in vocational achievement is dependent upon other factors which are linked with sex. It is the men who are both young and relatively well educated who are most successful. Those who were disabled before the age of forty-five, who were relatively "upper class," and whose disabilities were relatively free from social stigma had the best vocational achievements. Furthermore, these men were more likely to be in white-collar jobs at follow-up and to have experienced lengthy on-the-job training.

Race

It was hypothesized that whites would be more successful than non-whites, since discrimination in employment practices is expected to apply to the non-white disabled at least as much as it applies to the non-white non-disabled. However, the race of the respondent appears to be unrelated to his vocational success or failure, with the exception that whites were somewhat more likely than non-whites to be involuntarily out of the labor force.¹ Twenty-six percent of the whites and twenty-seven percent of the non-whites were most successful. However, forty-six percent of the whites were involuntarily out of the labor force, compared with thirty-six percent of the non-whites.

This absence of a finding was surprising and called for some kind of specification. It might be, on the one hand, that the intensive efforts

¹Contrary to these findings, Jaffe, Day, and Adams found non-whites over-represented among the unemployed in their sample of disabled men who had been injured by on-the-job accidents. Even in this study, as in theirs, one categorized as white (excluding Puerto Ricans), versus Negro and Puerto Rican; see Jaffe, Day, and Adams, pp. 12-13.

exerted in rehabilitating, training, and placing the disabled are sufficient to remove the normally discriminating effects of race in employment practices. On the other hand, perhaps discrimination does exist, but is masked by other factors which exert stronger influences upon job success. Additional variables were therefore introduced to clarify this situation.

No differences emerge when age, education, sex or job interest at intake are held constant.

Whites disabled before the age of eighteen and non-whites disabled between the ages of nineteen and forty-four were most successful. Thirty-four percent of whites disabled before the age of eighteen were most successful, compared with nineteen percent of the non-whites. But thirty-seven percent of the non-whites disabled between the ages of nineteen and forty-four were most successful, against twenty-six percent of the whites. There were no differences between the races by age at the onset of the disability.

Whites with the least severe disabilities were especially successful, followed by non-whites in the moderate severity group.¹ Forty-one percent of the least severely disabled whites were most successful, versus thirty percent of the least disabled non-whites. Thirty-six percent of the moderately disabled non-whites were most successful, against twenty-nine percent of the whites. Among the most disabled, there were no

¹The severity of the disabilities is an index consisting of eight variables: the number of disabilities, whether physical mobility was affected, whether a chain disability was present, whether pain or discomfort were voluntarily mentioned, the perceived effects of the disability, whether the respondent was receiving medical care for the disability, and whether the disability was the reason for unemployment.

differences between the races. Surprisingly, whites were more likely than non-whites to be severely disabled.

Non-whites who were not labelled by others as handicapped or disabled were most likely to be successful.¹ Those who were not white and at the same time were treated differently by others as a result of the disability were least likely to be successful. Among those who were not labelled, twenty-eight percent of the whites and thirty-seven percent of the non-whites were most successful. Among those who were labelled, twenty-three percent of the whites and only eleven percent of the non-whites were most successful. Labelling appears to have a much larger impact upon the success of non-whites than of whites. This is probably the result of the addition of race to the disability and the lack of education as handicapping factors, increasing their vulnerability toward negative evaluations by both self and others. Interestingly, non-whites were no more likely than whites to be labelled this way.

Work level also specifies the problem. The manual skilled group is the most successful, regardless of race. Among the unskilled manual group, however, it is the non-whites who exceed the whites in vocational achievement. Fifteen percent of the whites in unskilled manual jobs were most successful, compared with thirty percent of the non-whites. Non-whites tend to occupy unskilled manual jobs, whereas whites tend to have white-collar jobs.

Finally, whites with at least two financial dependents were more likely to be vocationally successful.² The number of dependents does not

¹The labelling index measures the extent to which the respondents were asked by others as disabled and treated differently as a result. Labelling implies the perception that the person is physically abnormal, and is a measure of perceived stigma.

²"Do any of these people rely on you for some of their money?"

seem to be significantly related to vocational success for non-whites. Forty-five percent of the white respondents with two or more financial dependents were most successful, compared with thirty percent of the non-whites. This is probably the result of the somewhat weaker and more patriarchal family structure among blacks, who constitute seventy-five percent of the non-white respondents.

Although race was not at first related to vocational achievement, the introduction of additional variables showed that differences between whites and non-whites occur in the way these variables affect the probability of employment success. Whites who were disabled before the age of eighteen, with the least severe disabilities, and with two or more financial dependents tended to be most successful. The most successful non-whites were disabled when middle-aged, had moderately severe disabilities, were not labeled by others as handicapped, and occupied unskilled manual jobs.

Age

It was hypothesized that the young would be more successful, since they are likely to be least severely disabled and most amenable to new industrial techniques. This is upheld. Although more than half of the respondents were fifty years of age or older, it was the young who were far more likely to be successful if employed. Forty-one percent of those younger than thirty were most successful, and this figure decreases to thirteen percent of those sixty-one years of age or older. Those younger than age thirty or older than age sixty were

most likely to be unemployed.¹

As expected, the association between age and employment success is dependent upon severity. Among those with less severe disabilities, the proportion of "most successful" persons declines steadily with age; within each age group except the oldest, those whose disabilities were less severe were most likely to be successful. Forty-six percent of those with the least severe disabilities between the ages of eighteen and forty were most successful, against only nine percent of those older than sixty-one. Among the more severely disabled, however, there is no relationship between age and success.

The relationship is also dependent upon whether or not the respondent was labelled by others as handicapped. The younger people were much more likely to be successful if they were not treated differently by others. Labelling has a much smaller impact upon the older workers. Overall, there is a stronger relationship between age and success in the "unlabelled group." Fifty percent of those between the ages of eighteen and forty who were not labelled were most successful, compared with eleven percent of those older than sixty-one. Among those who were labelled, however, thirty percent of the youngest group was most successful, against thirteen percent of the oldest group.

¹Previous research concerning the effects of age upon the vocational experiences of the disabled has not produced consistent findings. Lesser and Darling found that the unemployed tended to be younger than twenty-five or older than sixty; Lesser and Darling, p. 104. McPhee found that those younger than thirty were most likely to be employed; McPhee pp. 562-563. Jaffe found that those younger than forty-five were most likely to have achieved occupational mobility; Jaffe, Day and Adams, p. 121. Schletzer et al., and Ware found no differences in employment by age; Schletzer et al. Factors Related to Employment Success, p. 17; Ware, p. 517.

This relationship is also dependent upon job level. The most consistent relationship between age and success occurs for white-collar workers. Fifty-four percent of the white-collar workers younger than forty were most successful, compared with thirty-two percent of those older than fifty-one. Among skilled manual workers, the young and middle-aged were more successful than the old. Sixty-eight percent of the youngest group was most successful, versus thirty-eight percent of the oldest group. Among unskilled workers, the linear relationship between age and success disappears, but it is those who are both old and unskilled who were least likely to have received the raises or promotions which constitute the measure of success in this study; only eleven percent of this group was most successful.

The finding that the young were most successful is not interpreted by sex, education, socio-economic status, age at the onset of the disability, number of financial dependents, the degree of stigma attached to the disability, or by whether the respondent had worked before becoming disabled. It is not specified by marital status, having undertaken special training to acquire new skills, job interest at intake, or the voluntary mention of age as an additional handicap to employment.

The young were most successful in the labor market, especially if they were not severely disabled, not labelled by others as handicapped and in skilled manual jobs.

Socio-Economic Status

As expected, those who were relatively "upper class" were far more likely than those who were "lower class" to be both employed and highly successful over time. Forty-seven percent of the "upper class" was most

successful, against thirty percent of the "middle class" and eight percent of the "lower class." Only two percent of the "upper class" was unemployed, compared with fifty-five percent of the "lower class." Although the components of the two indices are similar, they measure different social attributes. The index of socio-economic status includes education, family income, and occupation of head of household, while the index of vocational achievement encompasses employment status and changes in salary and job level since placement. The strength of the relationship between relative socio-economic status and vocational achievement is large, given that the respondents actually ranged no higher than what is generally accepted as middle-middle class in this society.

This relationship is contingent upon sex: when the respondents are stratified by sex, the relationship is upheld only among men. Fifty-six percent of the "upper class" men were most successful, compared with only ten percent of the "lower class" men. There is no relationship between sex and socio-economic status.

The relationship is intensified if the number of other family members who were employed is taken into account.¹ Among families with no other workers, the disproportionate success of the "upper class" is even greater than among families with two or more workers. This was designed as a test of the influence of the income of others upon family income as a component of socio-economic status. Although the respondents in the "upper class" were most likely to have others in their families working, it is those with families in which they were the only working members who were most likely to be successful. Among those who were the only working

¹"Do any of these people have jobs?"

members of their families, fifty-six percent of the "upper class" was most successful, compared with eight percent of the "lower class."

Among those with other family members employed, however, forty-two percent of the "upper class" was most successful, against eight percent of the "lower class."

This relationship is not dependent upon any of the following variables: age (those in the "upper class" were relatively young), if the respondent was the head of his household, the severity of the disability (those in the "upper class" were less likely to be severely disabled), the stigma attached to the disability, whether the respondent was labelled by others as disabled, age at the onset of the disability (those in the "upper class" were more likely to be disabled, when very young), whether the respondent had worked before becoming disabled, job interest at intake (those in the "upper class" were more likely to be interested in white-collar jobs), the number of financial dependents (those in the "upper class" were more likely to have financial dependents), on-the-job training (those in the "upper class" were more likely to have lengthy on-the-job training), and ethnic stock.

The "upper class" was most successful, and this was especially so for those who were men and the only working members of their families.

CHAPTER VI

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE NATURE OF THE DISABILITYAND VOCATIONAL ACHIEVEMENTAge When Disabled

It was hypothesized that those disabled when relatively young would be more successful, since few occupational plans had been disrupted by the onset of the disability. Those disabled before the age of forty-five were more likely to be vocationally successful and less likely to be unemployed than those disabled after this age. Thirty-one percent of those disabled before the age of nineteen were most successful, compared with twenty-nine percent of those disabled between ages nineteen and forty-four and only eighteen percent of those disabled after age forty-four. Only twenty-two percent of those disabled before nineteen were unemployed at follow-up, against twenty-six percent of those disabled between nineteen and forty-four and thirty-nine percent of those disabled after forty-four. If unemployed, those disabled when young were more likely to be in the labor force or voluntarily out of the labor force. Those disabled after the age of forty-four were most likely to be involuntarily out of the labor force. Separating those who were congenitally disabled makes no difference in this relationship.¹

¹According to three other follow-up studies of the handicapped, it is the congenitally disabled, and those disabled when older, who are most likely to be unemployed, with those disabled in the middle years most likely to be employed; see Lesser and Darling, p. 101, Felton, p. 505, and Schletzer et al., Factors Related to Employment Success, p. 17-21. According to McPhee, those disabled before age forty were most likely to be employed full time; McPhee, p. 563. Ware found no differences in employment status by the onset of the disability; Ware, p. 517.

The relationship between age at onset of the disability and vocational success is reduced by socio-economic status at the time of the interview. When the respondents are stratified by their social positions, the original relationship is substantially diminished. Socio-economic status provides a link through which the original association was produced, since all three variables are interrelated. Those disabled before the age of eighteen tend to be "upper class," whereas those disabled after the age of forty-four tend to fall into the "lower class."

This relationship between age when disabled and employment success is dependent upon sex. Men who were disabled before the age of forty-four were especially successful; the relationship between the variables is reduced among women. Forty percent of the men disabled before the age of nineteen were most successful, compared with thirty-six percent of those disabled between nineteen and forty-four and twenty percent of those disabled after the age of forty-four. Among the women, nineteen percent of those disabled before nineteen were most successful, compared with thirteen percent of those disabled between nineteen and forty-four and twelve percent of those disabled after forty-four.

The relationship is contingent upon job level: the influence of being young at the time of the disability is effective only if the respondents were in manual rather than white-collar positions at the time of the interview. Among those in skilled manual jobs, sixty-eight percent of those disabled before age nineteen were most successful, versus forty-seven percent of those disabled after age forty-four. Among those in unskilled manual jobs, twenty percent of those disabled when youngest were most successful, against five percent of those disabled when oldest.

It also contingent upon job interest at intake: those disabled when young were most likely to be successful if they sought skilled manual positions at that time. Fifty-six percent of those disabled before age nineteen were most successful if they sought skilled manual jobs, compared with forty-two percent of those disabled between nineteen and forty-four, and twenty-four percent of those disabled after age forty-four.

The association between age when disabled and vocational achievement is not explained by current age, the number of years since the disability, or race. It is not interpreted by socio-economic status, whether the respondent had worked before becoming disabled, or by the severity or stigma of the disability. It is not contingent upon whether the respondent was labelled by others as disabled, whether he had specific job requirements when looking for his last position, on-the-job training, job satisfaction, whether formal or informal job-finding channels were used, or marital status.

Those disabled before the age of forty-five were most likely to be successful in the labor market, especially if they were men, interested in skilled manual positions when they first came to the sponsoring agency, or occupants of such positions at the time of the follow-up interview. The lower likelihood of success among those disabled later in life, on the other hand, was decreased still further among women and those who sought unskilled manual work at the time of the initial interview or who were engaged in unskilled manual work at follow-up.

Stigma and Visibility

It was hypothesized that those with non-visible and non-stigmatized disabilities would be most successful, since they were less likely to encounter discrimination in employment practices.

The stigma attached to the disability is related to vocational achievement. Those whose disabilities were free from stigma were most likely to be successful, although there were no differences in employment status. Forty-three percent of those whose disabilities were not stigmatized were most successful, compared with twenty-six percent of those whose disabilities were stigmatized. Dividing those whose disabilities were stigmatized into low, medium, and high degrees of stigma does not change the results. Because there were only fourteen respondents whose disabilities were free from stigma, efforts to elaborate these data are severely restricted. Compared to those with stigmatized disabilities, the respondents without stigma were white, less severely disabled, less likely to be labelled by others as disabled, interested in skilled manual jobs at intake, occupants of white-collar jobs at follow-up, and satisfied with their jobs. Those with stigmatized disabilities tended to be younger and disabled before the age of forty-five. There were no differences when sex and socio-economic status were controlled.

Contrary to the hypothesis, there was no direct relationship between the visibility of the disability and vocational achievement; those whose disabilities were "somewhat visible" were most frequently successful and least frequently unemployed. The combination of visibility and stigma produce an interesting pattern.¹ It is those whose disabilities were not visible and who at the same time were relatively free from stigma, and also those with the most visible and most highly stigmatized disabilities who were especially successful. Evidently, it was those for whom the

¹Although the concept of stigma encompasses visibility as one of its components, it is not a one-to-one relationship -- for example, included among disabilities with low stigma are arthritis and muscular atrophy; disabilities coded as having high stigma include colostomy and brain damage. However, the category of high stigma includes only three nonvisible disabilities, whereas the category of "no stigma" contains no visible disabilities.

handicapping effects of the disability were either the easiest or the most difficult to overcome who managed to achieve success in the labor force.

Severity

It was hypothesized that those with relatively mild disabilities would be most successful, since the impairment is less likely to impinge upon their work performances or abilities.

Although the severity of the disability is not associated with the degree of vocational achievement, it is related to whether the respondent was employed at follow-up. Eighty-eight percent of those with the least severe disabilities were employed, compared with forty percent of those with the most severe disabilities.¹

The relationship between severity and employment status is dependent upon whether the respondent was labelled by others as handicapped and consequently treated differently. Those who were not labelled this way were especially likely to be employed. Ninety-four percent of those not labelled were employed if they were not severely disabled, compared with thirty-eight percent of the most severely disabled. Among those who were labelled, eighty-one percent of the least severely disabled were employed, against forty percent of the most severely disabled.

¹Felton, who defined vocational adjustment as employment in competitive industry and maladjustment as employment in sheltered workshops, discovered severity to be related to these criteria; Felton, p. 505. Lesser and Darling, using the more conventional measure of vocational success as employment or unemployment, also found severity to be an important factor; Lesser and Darling, p. 102. McPhee found that "good health" was associated with employment; McPhee, p. 563.

The association is dependent upon whether the respondent had worked before the onset of the disability. Those who had some work experience before becoming disabled and who were not severely disabled were most likely to be employed at follow-up. Ninety percent of those who worked before the onset of the disability and who had mild disabilities were employed, compared with thirty-five percent of the most severely disabled. Among those who did not work before becoming disabled, eighty-five percent of the least severely disabled were employed, versus fifty-six percent of the most severely disabled.

The association is also dependent upon the difficulty experienced in using public transportation.¹ Surprisingly, those who had such problems were able to overcome them to the extent that they were employed at follow-up, given that the disabilities were not very severe. Those who were both severely disabled and found public transportation difficult to use were least likely to be employed. Among those who had problems using transportation, eighty-five percent of the least severely disabled were employed at follow-up, compared with forty-seven percent of the most severely disabled. Of those who experienced no difficulties in using transportation, eighty-one percent of the least severely disabled were employed, against seventy percent of the most severely disabled.

The original relationship is not explained by age or age at onset of the disability, and it is not interpreted by socio-economic status or by whether the disability impinged upon the work abilities or performances.

¹"Are there any kinds of transportation that you have difficulty using?"

It is not specified by job interest at intake or having specific requirements when looking for the last job held.

Those with relatively mild disabilities were most likely to be employed at follow-up, especially if they were not labelled by others as handicapped. The probability of being employed is further reduced among those severely disabled if they had worked before becoming disabled and if they had difficulty using public transportation.

Special Training

It was hypothesized that those who undertook special training to acquire new skills after the onset of the disability would be most successful, especially if they could no longer pursue their usual line of work due to the disruption of their careers by the onset of the disability.

The hypothesis was not upheld.¹ Training made no difference in either the degree of job success or in whether the respondent was employed or unemployed at follow-up. Separating the respondents according to the number of trainings does not alter this finding. The only impact that special training had upon vocational behavior was among the unemployed who were not in the labor force: those with special training tended to be voluntarily out of the labor force, whereas those without such training tended to be involuntarily out of the labor force. Thirty-three percent of those who had undertaken training and who were unemployed were voluntarily out of the labor force and thirty-three percent were involuntarily

¹Barker, after reviewing a number of older studies, found "no evidence in support of the thesis that training is advantageous in avoiding unemployment." See Roger G. Barker *et al.* Adjustment to Physical Handicap and Illness: A Survey of the Social Psychology of Physique and Disability, 2nd ed. revised (New York: Social Science Research Council, Bulletin 55, 1953), p. 367. According to McPhee and Felton, however, having received vocational training is associated with success; McPhee, pp. 562-563 and Felton, p. 505.

out of the labor force, compared with fifteen and fifty-six percent of those who did not have training. Evidently, having undertaken training does affect the respondents' perceptions about whether they could return to work if they desired.

Since the assumption that special training as the key to vocational success is crucial to current practices of rehabilitation personnel, efforts to specify these data were made. Although half of the respondents had undertaken this kind of training, more than one-third of those trained were unable to apply their training to any job they had held.

Dividing those who did have training according to its perceived general usefulness, its usefulness with respect to finding employment, and its usefulness in the actual job situation did not distinguish these respondents from those who did not have special training.

No differences in employment success emerged when the following variables were held constant: age (those younger than fifty tended to have been trained), education, socio-economic status (those in the "upper class" at follow-up tended to have been trained), medical prognosis, whether the respondent could pursue the same type of work as before the onset of the disability (interestingly, there was no relationship between this and having been trained), the number of financial dependents, and job level at follow-up (those in unskilled manual positions were least likely to have been trained).

Training was especially effective among those who had been advised by others to acquire some training or additional training. Among those who received this advice, thirty percent of those who had training

were most successful, compared with twelve percent of those with no training. There is no difference in the proportion most successful among those who were not advised to pursue training. The advice to get training or additional training is not related to whether the respondent had already undertaken such training.

Non-whites who received training are more successful than non-whites without such training. Thirty-one percent of the non-whites who were trained were most successful, versus twenty percent of the whites. Among whites training made no significant difference in employment success. Non-whites were more likely than whites to have been specially trained.

It is those who were disabled after the age of forty-five who were most likely to have benefited from training. Twenty-eight percent of these people were most successful, compared with twelve percent who had not been trained. Training made little difference in the employment success of those disabled when younger. Interestingly, it is those disabled after the age of forty-five who were least likely to have been trained, although training had the greatest impact upon the success of this group in the labor market.

Those whose disabilities were not highly stigmatized were most likely to be positively affected by training. Thirty-three percent of those with no stigma or little stigma who had undertaken training were most successful, compared with twenty-four percent who did not have training. It is this same group which also was most likely to receive special training.

Although there was initially no relationship between special training and vocational achievement, the introduction of additional variables revealed that differences between those who did and did not undertake such training occur in the way that these variables affect the probability of

job success. The impact of training was positive in some specific groups: those who had been advised to undertake training, who were non-white, who were disabled after the age of forty-five, and whose disabilities were not highly stigmatized.

In addition to testing the impact of special training upon vocational achievement, two factors similar to training were also examined.

Whether or not the respondents had received any physical therapy in the course of rehabilitation was unrelated to both the degree of job success and employment status. Among the unemployed, however, those who had received physical therapy were more likely than those who had not to be in the labor force. Evidently, the effect of physical therapy is similar to that of special training in that it affects perceptions about whether the respondent is capable of working. Similarly, the number of rehabilitation agencies which had serviced these people is not related to vocational achievement.

There is a relationship, however, between receiving lengthy on-the-job training and vocational achievement. Those who received training on their current jobs for seven days or more were far more likely to be successful than those with less training and those with no training at all. Among those with training for seven days or more, fifty-two percent were most successful, compared with thirty-two percent of those with less training or no training.

This relationship is dependent upon age. Those younger than forty were more likely than those older than forty to benefit from on-the-job training. It was these same people who were most likely to receive such training. Eighty percent of those younger than forty were most successful

if they had received lengthy on-the-job training, compared with thirty-eight percent of these young people without this training.

This relationship is also conditional upon having disabilities which are not very severe. It is only among those with the least severe disabilities that the relationship is maintained; most of these people are likely to also be younger than forty. Among those with the least severe disabilities, seventy percent of those with lengthy on-the-job training were most successful, compared with thirty-five percent of those who did not have this training.

The association between lengthy on-the-job training and job success is not explained by socio-economic status, age at the onset of the disability, labelling by others as disabled, social adjustment to the disability, having specific requirements when looking for this job, or job level. It is not specified by sex, the stigma attached to the disability, whether the respondent could do the same kind of work as before becoming disabled, whether special training had been undertaken in rehabilitation, or job satisfaction.

CHAPTER VII

FACTORS RELATED TO THE NATURE OF THE JOBJob Interest At Intake

It was hypothesized that those who aspired to white-collar jobs at intake would be successful, since these jobs do not require physical exertion and since they are higher in the occupational prestige system. Contrary to the hypothesis, those who were interested in skilled manual jobs at intake, followed by those interested in white-collar jobs, had the best vocational achievements. Thirty-nine percent of those interested in skilled manual positions were most successful, compared with twenty-four percent of those interested in white-collar jobs and twenty percent of those interested in unskilled manual jobs. Because those who aspired at intake to white-collar jobs were more likely to have been severely disabled, the original hypothesis now appears erroneous. Those who sought skilled manual jobs at intake were more likely than those who sought other jobs to be less severely disabled at follow-up. Moreover, those who aspired to and attained manual jobs at intake had the greatest potential for upward mobility, whereas those who aspired to and attained white-collar jobs were less likely to increase their job levels and therefore their vocational achievement, given the design of the index.

The relationship between job interest at intake and vocational achievement is dependent, however, upon socio-economic position, as measured by education, family income, and occupation of head of household.

This original relationship is intensified among those in the "middle" and "upper class," whereas it disappears among those in the "lower class." Among those in the "upper and "middle classes," fifty-five percent of those interested in skilled manual positions were most successful, against thirty-five percent of those interested in white-collar jobs and twenty-eight percent of those interested in unskilled manual jobs.

The relationship is conditional upon age at the onset of the disability. Those who sought skilled manual positions at intake were especially successful if they had been disabled earlier than age eighteen. Among those disabled when young, fifty-six percent who sought skilled manual jobs were most successful, compared with only twenty-seven percent of those who were interested in white-collar jobs and twenty percent of those interested in unskilled manual jobs.

The association is also conditional upon whether the respondent had worked before becoming disabled. It occurs only among those who did not work prior to the disability. Sixty-seven percent of those who did not work before becoming disabled and who sought skilled manual jobs were most successful, compared with twenty-six percent of those who sought white-collar jobs and twenty percent of those who sought unskilled manual jobs. This unexpected situation is probably explained by the previous finding that those interested in skilled manual positions were most successful if disabled when young, since the young were unlikely to have worked before becoming disabled.

The association is not explained by race, the severity of the disabilities, or the number of financial dependents, and it is not interpreted by job level at follow-up. Moreover, the introduction of the following variables does not specify the relationship: age, age at intake, the stigma attached to the disability, and whether the respondent was labelled by others

as disabled.

Job-Finding Channels

It was hypothesized that those who used formal methods of finding jobs since placement would be more successful than those who used informal channels, since formal means of job-seeking were thought to result in a better congruence of man and job. Contrary to the hypothesis, those who used formal channels (newspapers, commercial employment agencies, rehabilitation agencies, and poverty agencies) in seeking jobs since they first applied to the sponsoring agency were less likely to be employed than those who used informal channels (informal contacts, direct contacts with employers, and self-employment). Those who combined these two modes were most likely to be employed. Seventy-seven percent of those using mixed channels were employed, compared with sixty-eight percent of those using only informal channels and thirty-three percent of those using only formal channels. There were no differences between the groups according to the degree of vocational success. It appears that among this population of poorly educated disabled people, informal channels were actually more efficient than formal channels in locating the jobs for which they could qualify for those who had the possibility of utilizing informal contacts.

This relationship is especially strong among those who were disabled at an early age. Eighty-three percent of those disabled before age eighteen were most successful if they used mixed or informal channels, against twenty percent of those who used formal channels exclusively. It can be speculated that those who were disabled from the start of their work careers may have gained more information and contacts about

informal channels and more facility in using informal approaches.

The relationship is intensified by relatively high stigma. Formal channels were least likely to be associated with employment among those with medium and high stigma. Seventy-five percent of those whose disabilities were highly stigmatized were most successful if they used mixed or informal job channels, versus twenty-five percent of those who relied upon formal job channels. Perhaps those who were socially stigmatized were reluctant to encounter formal situations in seeking jobs.

The association is not dependent upon any of the following variables: sex, age, socio-economic status, number of financial dependents, frequency of seeing friends, the severity of the disability, or whether the respondent was labelled by others as disabled.

Voluntary Disclosure of the Disability

It was hypothesized that those who disclosed the disability to potential employers would be successful, since they exhibited greater realism in their job searches and since they were less likely to encounter future difficulties in this area. However, revealing the nature of the disability to potential employers when seeking jobs is not related to either vocational achievement or employment status.¹ It is possible, however, that the respondents were not completely honest in answering this question, since it is the explicit policy of the sponsoring agency to urge applicants to openly tell employers about their disabilities. Sixty-nine percent revealed the disability voluntarily to employers, and four percent involuntarily. Ten percent did not tell employers because they thought it irrelevant, and sixteen percent did not tell so that they would be hired.

¹Q.90: "When you are looking for work, do you tell employers about your disability? Why? (Why not?)"

It is possible that the responses to this item were contaminated by the visibility of the disabilities, since seventy-one percent of those who disclosed their disabilities to potential employers had disabilities which were at least partly visible. Moreover, financial or social pressures to work may blur the impact of this factor upon vocational achievement, since more than half of those who did not inform employers about their disability explained by saying they would not otherwise be hired.

Job Requirements

It was hypothesized that those who had specific job requirements which were met would be most successful, since they were likely to be more purposeful in their job searches and to be more satisfied with the jobs received.¹

The hypothesis was not upheld. Those who had no specific requirements when seeking their last job were more likely to be employed at follow-up than those who had specific job needs. Eighty-two percent of those with no specific job requirements were employed at follow-up, compared with sixty-nine percent of those with requirements. There was no difference in the degree of vocational success among those with and without specific job requirements. It is likely that those who were willing to accept any kind of job were more able to obtain employment than those who were more selective in their job searches.

This relationship is conditional upon three factors: the absence of high stigma, having worked before becoming disabled, and blue-collar job interest at intake.

¹"When you were looking for this job, did you have any definite ideas about: a) the type of job you wanted? b) the location of the company? c) the hours you wanted? d) the salary you wanted? e) anything else?"

The relationship between not having specific job requirements and being employed at follow-up is conditional upon having disabilities that are not highly stigmatized. The association is absent among those with highly stigmatized disabilities. Among those without high stigma, ninety percent of those with no specific job requirements were employed, versus sixty-seven percent of those with specific job requirements.

Those without specific requirements were most likely to be employed if they had some work experience prior to the onset of the disability. Among those with no prior experience, whether or not there were specific job requirements is not associated with the probability of employment. Among those who worked before becoming disabled, eighty-six percent of those without specific job requirements were employed, compared with sixty-three percent of those with such requirements.

Finally, the influence of not having specific job requirements upon employment status is especially strong for those who were interested in blue-collar jobs at intake. The association is not maintained among those who sought white-collar jobs. Eighty-six percent of those who sought blue-collar jobs were employed if they had no specific job requirements, versus sixty-three percent of those with specific requirements.

The relationship is not explained by sex or whether the respondent was labelled by others as disabled. It is not conditional upon age, socio-economic status, the severity of the disabilities, age at onset of the disability, the number of financial dependents, or whether special training to acquire new skills was undertaken after the onset of the disability.

Job Level

It was hypothesized that those in white-collar jobs at follow-up

would be more successful than those in blue-collar jobs, since the disability is less apt to impinge upon white-collar work, and the jobs are likely to be associated with greater job satisfaction in the context of the system of occupational rewards and prestige.

Contrary to the hypothesis, those who held skilled manual jobs, followed by those in white-collar jobs, were most successful; almost half of those with unskilled manual jobs were least successful. Fifty-four percent of those in skilled manual jobs were most successful, compared with thirty-nine percent of those in white-collar jobs and twenty percent of those in unskilled manual jobs. This reinforces the previous finding that those who sought skilled manual jobs at intake also tended to be among the most successful.¹

This relationship is dependent, however, upon age. The likelihood of vocational success decreases with age if the respondent held a skilled manual job. The relationship is especially strong for those between the ages of eighteen and forty. Sixty-eight percent of those younger than forty in skilled manual jobs were most successful, compared with fifty-four percent of those in white-collar jobs and twenty-five percent of those in unskilled manual jobs.

It is intensified by having received lengthy on-the-job training. The influence of skilled manual positions upon vocational success is most pronounced among those who received this training on their current jobs

¹Schletzer *et al.*, however, found no relationship between occupational level and job success; Schletzer *et al.*, Factors Related to Employment Success, p. 22.

for at least seven days. Even among those with little or no training, however, the skilled manual workers were still most likely to be successful. Among those with lengthy on-the-job training, seventy-nine percent of those in skilled manual positions were most successful, compared with forty-nine percent of those in white-collar jobs and twenty-seven percent of those in unskilled manual jobs. This is in contrast with those who had less on-the-job training or none at all: forty-seven percent of those who held skilled manual jobs were most successful, compared with thirty-four percent of those in white-collar jobs and nineteen percent of those in unskilled manual jobs.

The relationship is also intensified when the number of financial dependents is taken into account. Those in skilled manual positions who were financially responsible for at least one other person were far more likely to be successful than those with no financial dependents. Among those with financial dependents, sixty-one percent of those in skilled manual jobs were most successful, compared with thirty-nine percent of those in white-collar jobs and sixteen percent of those in unskilled manual jobs.

The association between skilled manual jobs and vocational success is not explained by race, socio-economic status, or having undertaken special training, and it is not interpreted by salary at follow-up. The frequencies were too small to control this relationship by sex, although fully ninety percent of those who occupied skilled manual positions were men. The introduction of the following variables did not aid in specifying the relationship: age at the onset of the disability, the severity or stigma of the disability, whether the respondent was labelled by others as disabled, whether the respondent worked prior to becoming disabled, and job satisfaction.

A secondary aim of this study was to discover the impact upon these poorly educated and disabled workers of technological changes, such as automation, that may have occurred in job requirements since placements. However, few respondents to this study had ever worked in a place where automation was important. Even fewer felt that new industrial techniques had affected them at all. However, given the educational limitations of the sample and other reinforcements in the data of the lack of sophistication and the restricted opportunities of these respondents these figures may be underestimated.

The respondents were asked: "Have you ever worked in any place that had very new and modern equipment?" Six percent had worked in a place that was computerized, thirty-two percent had worked with modern machinery, four percent had worked with both, and fifty-eight percent had worked with neither. However, only fifteen percent felt that they had been affected by new industrial techniques. Upon probing, sixteen percent responded that new jobs had been made available to them and twenty-two percent felt that it had made work easier for them. Only three percent had lost jobs because of automation or new machinery. Because of the small number of people who were consistently affected by new industrial techniques, further elaboration of the data was not possible. A larger sample of disabled people might well yield significant factors concerning the relationships among the respondents and the probabilities of being positively or negatively affected by industrial changes.

Vocational Self-Image

Vocational self-image was measured by a series of seven items.¹

Yuker and his associates documented that the disabled project their own attitudes onto the attitudes of others when responding to these kinds of questions.²

¹"Compared to other people who do this kind of work, how good a worker would you say you are? Do you think you're about the same (N=156), better (N=103), or worse (N=3)? (Don't know or no answer: N=18).

"Compared to others, how good a worker does your supervisor think you are? Does he think you're the same (N=113), better (N=118), or worse (N=2). (Don't know: N=29, no supervisor: N=18).

"In general, how do you think most people feel about working with someone who is handicapped? (PROBE: Why do you say that?)" (Doesn't bother them: N=224, does bother them: N=43, mixed or depends: N=39, don't know or no answer: N=83).

"How do you think most employers feel about hiring someone who is handicapped? (PROBE: Why do you say that?)" (Will hire: N=131, won't hire: N=134, mixed or skeptical: N=75, don't know or no answer: N=49).

"Do you think that handicapped workers should be supervised more closely than other workers? a) Why do you think so? (Why don't you think so?)" (Yes: N=37, no: N=287, qualified or mixed: N=56, don't know: N=9).

"Compared to people who are not handicapped, do you think that handicapped people do the same job (N=145), a better job (N=190), or a worse job (N=3)? a) Why do you say that?" (Depends: N=40, don't know: N=11).

"How would you feel about working with people who are handicapped? (PROBE: Why is that?)" (Don't mind: N=360, do mind: N=18, depends: N=6, don't know: N=5).

²Harold E. Yuker, J.R. Block, and Janet H. Youngg, The Measurement of Attitudes Toward Disabled Persons. (Albertson, N.Y.: Human Resources Center, 1966). See also Human Resources Center, The Development of Physiological and Psychological Measures Predictive of Adjustment to Disability, (Albertson, N.Y.: Human Resources Center, 1966).

It was hypothesized that those with positive self-images would be successful, since self-expectations are likely to be reflected in behavior. None of these items, however, are related to either the degree of vocational success or employment status.¹ This may be partly the result of the way in which some of these questions are "loaded": it is simpler for the respondents to say that the disabled in general and they in particular are not different from the non-disabled in work-related behavior than to explain why they are different. Moreover, the high proportion of don't knows, no answers, and qualified answers indicates that many experienced difficulties in responding to these items. In all, twenty-two percent of the responses to these seven questions produced uncertain answers. This is in itself probably a good indication of the negative effects that stem from the disabled status in this society. To show that this proportion of uncertain answers is not representative of the interview schedule, seven other non-factual items were randomly selected for comparison, resulting in only eight percent uncertain answers.

Need to Work

It was hypothesized that those who felt they must work, either because of financial need or social norms, would be successful, since perceived pressure is likely to result in action.

Those who had a financial need to work were more likely to be successfully employed than those who did not indicate this need when the number of dependents is used as an indicator of need.² There is a direct

¹Felton found that the more successful "viewed themselves as worthwhile, responsible workers and subordinated their handicaps to their positive capabilities and potential;" Felton, p. 505.

²This was supported by Felton, p. 505, and Schletzer et al., Factors Related to Employment Success, p. 25.

relationship between vocational success and the number of people who were dependent upon the respondent for support. Those who were financially responsible for at least two other persons were especially likely to be successful. Thirty-nine percent of those with two or more financial dependents were most successful, compared with twenty-eight percent of those with one dependent and nineteen percent of those with no dependents.

This relationship is dependent, however, upon age. The effect upon vocational success of having two or more financial dependents is especially strong for those between the ages of eighteen and forty, whereas it is reduced among those who were older. Fifty-five percent of those younger than forty with two or more financial dependents were most successful, compared with thirty-five percent of those with one dependent and twenty-seven percent of those with no dependents.

The association is conditional upon having disabilities which are not highly stigmatized. Those whose disabilities carried no stigma or little stigma were most likely to be successful if they were financially responsible for at least two other people. If the disability was one of medium or high stigma, having dependents made less difference in vocational success. Among those with little or no stigma, fifty percent of those with two or more financial dependents were most successful, against twenty-six percent of those with one dependent and twenty percent of those with no dependents.

The relationship between the number of dependents, as an indicator of financial need to work, is not explained by sex or race, and it is not interpreted by socio-economic status, job level, or job satisfaction. Moreover, the introduction of the following variables does not help to specify the relationship: age at the onset of the disability, the severity

of the disability, whether the respondent was labelled by others as disabled, whether formal or informal methods of finding jobs were used, having specific requirements when looking for work, or having undertaken special training to acquire new skills.

There is no association between vocational achievement and perceived social pressure or general preference to work.¹ Although an effort was made to avoid loading this question and a probe was used, the skewed marginals suggest that at least some bias was present: eighty-five percent said they would rather work than stay at home. As noted in Chapter II, among those who stated they preferred to work, eighteen percent gave such reasons as "I like to work" or "It's right to work." Forty-three percent said they wanted to be useful or busy, and thirty-five percent said they disliked staying home.

These data were elaborated to see whether a relationship with vocational achievement did exist when other variables were held constant. The introduction of the following variables did not specify the problem: sex, age, age at the onset of the disability, whether the respondent was labelled by others as disabled, job satisfaction, and the number of financial dependents. Evidently preference and financial pressures to work do not exert a cumulative influence upon vocational achievement.

However, the introduction of four other variables did specify the original absence of a relationship. Those in the "upper" and "middle" classes were especially likely to be successful if they expressed a preference to work. This pattern is absent in the "lower class." Among those in the "upper class," fifty percent who preferred to work were

¹Q.10: "If you didn't need the money, would you rather stay at home (N=58), or would you rather have a job (N=320)?" a) "Why do you say that?"

most successful, against thirty-five percent of those who preferred to stay at home. Among those in the "middle class," thirty-two percent who preferred to work were most successful, compared with twenty-four percent of those who preferred to stay at home.

Those who preferred to work with the least severe disabilities were most likely to be successfully employed. The relationship is reversed for those with moderately severe disabilities, with those preferring not to work more successful than those who would rather work. There are no differences among those with the most severe disabilities. Among those with the least severe disabilities, forty-four percent of those who preferred to work were most successful, compared with five percent of those who preferred to stay at home. Among those with moderately severe disabilities, however, twenty-nine percent of those who preferred to work were most successful, against forty-five percent of those who preferred to stay at home.

Surprisingly, those whose disabilities were most highly stigmatized were especially successful if they had expressed a preference to work. Thirty percent of those with highly stigmatized disabilities were most successful if they preferred to work, compared with fourteen percent of those who preferred to stay at home. Perhaps the very fact of having a job is sufficiently rewarding to those who are highly stigmatized to partly compensate for their social disadvantages.

Finally, those in white-collar jobs at follow-up were most likely to be successful if they preferred to work. Forty-two percent of those who occupied white-collar jobs were most successful if they preferred to work, compared with nineteen percent of those who would rather stay at home. This suggests that white-collar jobs were associated with

greater job satisfaction than blue-collar jobs, although the frequencies are too small to test the four variables simultaneously.

Although there was at first no relationship between the preference to work and vocational achievement, the introduction of additional variables revealed that those who preferred to work were likely to be successful in the labor market if they were in the "upper class," not severely disabled, stigmatized, and occupants of white-collar jobs.

Placement-Related Factors

It was hypothesized that those who had "successful" placements by the sponsoring agency, in terms of job level, job salary, and the fewer times placement was attempted would be successful, since success is more likely to be continued than reversed.

Although job level at placement is not associated with vocational success, those who earned the most at placement were likely to be successful at follow-up.¹ Respondents with weekly salaries of \$111 or more tended to be both successful and employed. Forty-eight percent of those with weekly salaries of \$111 or more were most successful, compared with only seventeen percent of those with weekly salaries below \$50. Their earnings were highest at placement, and they continued to increase their earnings and/or job level to the time of follow-up.

This relationship is conditional upon age. The effect of salary at placement upon success at follow-up is most pronounced among those between the ages of eighteen and forty, and it is reduced among those

¹McPhee found that those with weekly salaries of \$50 or more at closure were more likely to be employed at follow-up than those with smaller salaries; McPhee, pp. 562-563.

who were older. Sixty-eight percent of those younger than forty who earned \$91 or more were most successful, compared with forty-one percent of those who earned between \$71 and \$90 and twenty-two percent of those who earned less than \$70.

Similarly, it is conditional upon the duration of the disability prior to placement. Those earning the most at placement who had been disabled for a maximum of six years at that time were especially likely to be successful. Salary level at placement is not as strongly associated with subsequent success for those who had been disabled for a longer period prior to placement. Sixty-nine percent of those disabled for a maximum of six years at placement were most successful, compared with twenty-one percent of those earning less than \$70.

This relationship is not explained by sex or job level at placement. It is not specified by age at the onset of the disability, the severity or stigma of the disability, whether the respondent was labelled by others as disabled, or job interest at intake.

Whether the respondent was placed directly or indirectly by the sponsoring agency did not influence his vocational achievement. This is not specified by the number of times that placement was attempted. There is no association between success and either the length of time between intake and placement, or the amount of unemployment prior to intake.¹

Although the index was constructed to eliminate the effect of the year of placement upon the degree of success, those placed recently were more likely to be employed at follow-up than those placed less recently.

¹McPhee found that those employed at intake were more frequently employed at follow-up; MCPhee, pp. 562-563. Schletzer et al. found no differences by previous employment; Schletzer et al., Factors Related to Employment Success, pp. 21-22.

This is not conditional upon sex, age, socio-economic status, the severity of the disability, or the stigma of the disability.

Disability-Related Factors

It was hypothesized that those who experienced the fewest vocational changes by the onset of the disability, in terms of the nature of employment, the place of employment, and salary would be successful, since the impact of the disability upon career patterns was likely to be less critical.

These disability-related factors are not upheld by the data. There are no relationships between vocational achievement and changes in job level, changes in salary, or changes in employment site that coincide with the onset of the disability.¹ Although it was thought that this might be specified by the variation in time elapsed since the occurrence of the impairments, the introduction of this factor did not elaborate the data.

¹Although Jaffe, Day, and Adams located significant differences in success according to whether the job and employer were maintained after the disability, they studied men disabled within ten years of the interview; thirty-five percent of the respondents in this study were disabled within ten years of being interviewed. See Jaffe, Day, and Adams, pp. 65-70.

CHAPTER VIII

SUMMARY

This study was designed to discover the occupational experiences of those who are both physically disabled and poorly educated. Interviews were held with 389 permanently disabled men and women who were serviced by a private employment agency in New York during the period 1960 through 1967. Each respondent was medically cleared for full time work, but vocationally handicapped as a result of his disability. Only people with fewer than twelve years of formal education were interviewed, in order to concentrate upon those who were likely to have the greatest difficulties in securing and maintaining employment. This study represents an important step in beginning to understand the processes of adjustment between the needs of the marginal worker and the demands of the labor market.

An index of vocational achievement was constructed to measure the ability to function in the work situation with maximum rewards, given the limitations imposed by the disabled status. Unlike most previous studies, which equated employment at follow-up with success and unemployment with failure, the measure of vocational achievement includes employment status as well as changes in salary and major changes in job level since placement. Those employed at follow-up were divided into three groups: "most successful," "somewhat successful," and "least successful."

The demographic factors associated with vocational achievement are sex (men were more successful than women), age (the young were more successful), and "upper class" socio-economic status. Factors related to the nature of the disability associated with vocational achievement are onset of the disability before the age of forty-five and having disabilities which were free from stigma. Work-related factors associated with vocational achievement are interest in skilled manual jobs at intake, placement into relatively high-paying jobs, avoiding formal job-seeking channels since placement, not having specific job requirements when seeking the last job held, holding skilled manual positions at follow-up, having received lengthy on-the-job training, and having a financial need to work as indicated by the number of dependents.

Although only work-related factors are amenable to change from the point of view of the disabled individual, attention to all these factors by rehabilitation personnel should aid in attaining maximum vocational achievements.

REFERENCES

- Allport, G. W. Personality: A Psychological Interpretation. New York: Henry Holt, 1937.
- Arthur, Julietta K. Employment for the Handicapped. New York: Abingdon Press, 1967.
- Barker, Roger G. et al. Adjustment to Physical Handicap and Illness: A Survey of the Social Psychology of Physique and Disability. 2nd ed. revised. New York: Social Science Research Council, Bulletin 55, 1953.
- Burk, Richard D. "The Nature of Disability," Journal of Rehabilitation, 33 (November-December, 1967), 10-35.
- Davis, Fred. "Deviance Disavowal: The Management of Strained Interaction by the Visibly Handicapped," Social Problems, 9 (Fall, 1961), 120-132.
- Felton, J. S. "Factors Influencing the Successful Vocational Adjustment of the Physically Disabled," Rehabilitation Research. eds. George N. Wright and Ann Beck Trotter. Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1968, 493-507.
- Goffman, Erving. Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity. Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, 1964.
- Hamilton, Kenneth W. Counseling the Handicapped in the Rehabilitation Process. New York: Ronald Press, 1960.
- Human Resources Center. The Development of Physiological and Psychological Measures Predictive of Adjustment to Disability. Albertson, N. Y.: Human Resources Center, 1966.
- Hyman, Herbert H. Survey Design and Analysis. New York: Free Press, 1955.
- Jaffe, A. J., Day, Lincoln, H. and Adams, Walter. Disabled Workers in the Labor Market. Totowa, N. J.: Bedminster Press, 1964.
- Jordan, Sidney. "The Disadvantaged Group: A Concept Applicable to the Handicapped," Journal of Psychology, 55 (1963), 313-322.
- Kleck, Robert. "Emotional Arousal in Interaction with Stigmatized Persons," Psychological Reports, 19 (1966), 1226.
- Krusen, Frank H. Concepts in Rehabilitation of the Handicapped. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders and Co., 1964.
- Lazarsfeld, Paul F. "Evidence and Inference in Social Research," Daedalus, 87 (1958), 117-124.
- _____. "Interpretation of Statistical Relationships as a Research Operation," The Language of Social Research. eds. Paul F. Lazarsfeld and Morris Rosenberg. Glencoe: Free Press, 1955, 115-125.

- Lesser, Marion S. and Darling, Robert C. Factors Prognostic for Vocational Rehabilitation Among the Physically Handicapped, Research Conference on Workmen's Compensation and Vocational Rehabilitation. ed. A. J. Jaffe. New York: Columbia University, Bureau of Applied Social Research, 1961, 98-108.
- Lipton, Benjamin H., Lifton, Harvey H, and Morante, Edward A. Survey of Graduates of the Joseph Bulova School of Watchmaking. New York: Joseph Bulova School of Watchmaking, 1967.
- MacGregor, Frances Cooke. "Some Psycho-Social Problems Associated with Facial Deformities," Patients, Physicians, and Illness. ed. E. Gartly Jaco. Glencoe: Free Press, 1958, 269-270.
- McPhee, W. M. "Adjustment Characteristics of Closed Rehabilitation Cases," Rehabilitation Research. eds. George N. Wright and Ann Beck Trotter. Madison: University of Wisconsin, 1968, 558-571.
- Mussen, Paul H. and Barker, Roger G. "Attitudes Towards Cripples," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 39 (1944), 351-355.
- Myersohn, Lee. "Physical Disability as a Social Psychological Problem," Journal of Social Issues, 4 (Fall, 1948), 2-10.
- Schletzer, Vera Myers et al. Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation: VII, Factors Related to Employment Success. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Industrial Relations Center, 1959.
- _____. Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation: III, A Follow-Up Study of Placement Success. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Industrial Relations Center, 1958.
- Straus, Robert. "Social Change and the Rehabilitation Concept," Sociology and Rehabilitation. ed. Marvin B. Sussman. Washington, D. C.: American Sociological Association, 1966, 1-34.
- Tinsley, Howard E. A. et al. Minnesota Studies in Vocational Rehabilitation: XXVI, A Follow-Up Survey of Former Clients of the Minnesota Division of Vocational Rehabilitation. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, Industrial Relations Center, 1969.
- Wright, Beatrice A. Physical Disability: A Psychological Approach. New York: Harper, 1960.
- Yuker, Harold E., Block, J. R., and Youngg, J. The Measurement of Attitudes Toward Disabled Persons. Albertson, N. Y.: Human Resources Center, 1966.